arXiv:1703.10718v1 [math.AP] 31 Mar 2017

QUASI-INVARIANT GAUSSIAN MEASURES FOR THE TWO-DIMENSIONAL DEFOCUSING CUBIC NONLINEAR WAVE EQUATION

TADAHIRO OH AND NIKOLAY TZVETKOV

Abstract. We study the transport properties of the Gaussian measures on Sobolev spaces under the dynamics of the two-dimensional defocusing cubic nonlinear wave equation (NLW). Under some regularity condition, we prove quasi-invariance of the mean-zero Gaussian measures on Sobolev spaces for the NLW dynamics. We achieve this goal by introducing a simultaneous renormalization on the energy functional and its time derivative and establishing a renormalized energy estimate in the probabilistic setting.

1. Introduction

1.1. **General context.** In probability theory, the transport properties of Gaussian measures under linear and nonlinear transformations have attracted wide attention since the seminal work of Cameron-Martin [3]. In the context of transformations defined as the translation by a fixed vector, Cameron-Martin provided a complete answer to this question in [3]. This result then formed the basis of the infinite dimensional analysis, the so-called Malliavin calculus. In [18], Ramer further studied the transport property of Gaussian measures under a general nonlinear transformation on an abstract Wiener space and gave a criterion, guaranteeing that Gaussian measures are *quasi-invariant* under general transformations which are (essentially speaking) Hilbert-Schmidt perturbations of the identity. Here, by quasi-invariance, we mean that a measure μ on a measure space (X, μ) and the pushforward $T_*\mu$ of μ under a measurable transformation $T : X \to X$, defined by $T_*\mu = \mu \circ T^{-1}$, are equivalent, namely mutually absolutely continuous with respect to each other.

The quasi-invariance result by Ramer is of course more general than Cameron-Martin's result because it applies to general nonlinear transformations and it is certainly the best result one can expect in the context of general nonlinear transformations. It was then asked in the works by Cruzeiro [4, 5] whether, in the context of the maps given by the flows of vector fields, one can prove quasi-invariance of Gaussian measures by exploiting the particular properties of the vector field and therefore going beyond Ramer's analysis. In [4, 5], Cruzeiro established an abstract criterion, guaranteeing quasi-invariance of Gaussian measures under the flow generated by vector fields. We point out that the verification of such a criterion was not carried out for concrete examples in [4, 5].

In the recent works [23, 16, 13], we studied the transport property of Gaussian measures under nonlinear Hamiltonian PDE dynamics and succeeded to prove quasi-invariance of Gaussian measures, thus verifying the philosophy of [4, 5] in the case of concrete examples. In [23], we considered the BBM-type equations and by exploiting energy estimates which are

Key words and phrases. nonlinear wave equation; nonlinear Klein-Gordon equation; Gaussian measure; quasi-invariance.

quite standard in the field of hyperbolic PDEs, we established quasi-invariance of Gaussian measures on periodic functions, going beyond Ramer's result. In [16, 13], we studied the quasi-invariance property of Gaussian measures under the dynamics of the one-dimensional cubic fourth order nonlinear Schrödinger equation. By applying gauge transformations and (an infinite iteration of) normal form transformations, we proved quasi-invariance of Gaussian measures, which is optimal in terms of Sobolev regularities.

In the present paper, we will further develop the method of [23, 16] in the context of two-dimensional nonlinear wave equations (NLW). We follow the new strategy introduced by the second author in [23]. Namely, we prove the quasi-invariance property for a weighted Gaussian measure which is absolutely continuous with respect to the underlying Gaussian measure. The density of such a weighted Gaussian measure is inspired by an energy functional associated to the equation. Observe that our approach is already quite different compared to Ramer's analysis [18]. In a sharp contrast with the previous works [23, 16, 13], in this work, we need to use a *renormalized* energy functional. See Subsection 1.4. Such a renormalized energy is closely related to renormalizations considered in Euclidean quantum field theory [19]. On the one hand, such renormalizations often force us to work with renormalized equations. See [15] in the context of two-dimensional NLW endowed with Gibbs measures. On the other hand, this is *not* the case in our analysis; we are able to keep the original equation despite the use of the renormalized energy. This is achieved by performing a *simultaneous renormalization of the energy functional and its time derivative*. See Subsection 1.4 below. In particular, after introducing the renormalized energy, we establish a *renormalized energy estimate* that is suitable for studying the dynamical property of the original equation in the probabilistic manner. This renormalized energy estimate is the main novelty of this work. As we shall see below, its proof is quite intricate and it does not result from purely linear Gaussian considerations unlike the previous works [23, 16].

1.2. **Main result.** Consider the defocusing cubic nonlinear wave equation on $\mathbb{T}^2 = (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^2$:

$$\partial_t^2 u - \Delta u + u^3 = 0, \tag{1.1}$$

where $u : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ is the unknown function. With $v = \partial_t u$, we rewrite (1.1) as the following first order system:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u = v \\ \partial_t v = \Delta u - u^3. \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

The system (1.2) is a Hamiltonian system of PDEs with the Hamiltonian:

$$H(u, v) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \big(|\nabla u|^2 + v^2\big) dx + \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} u^4 dx. \tag{1.3}$$

It is easy to verify that, if (u, v) is a smooth solution to (1.2), then

$$\frac{d}{dt} H(u(t), v(t)) = 0.$$

In view of the structure of the Hamiltonian $H(u, v)$ and the properties of the linear wave equation, it is natural to study (1.2) in the space:

$$\mathcal{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^2) \equiv H^s(\mathbb{T}^2) \times H^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}^2),$$

where $H^s(\mathbb{T}^2)$ is the classical L^2-based Sobolev space of order s. By a classical argument (see the next section), one can show that (1.2) is globally well-posed in $\mathcal{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^2)$, $\sigma \geq 1$. Let us denote this global flow by $\Phi_{\text{NLW}}(t)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

Our main goal is to study the quasi-invariance property of the Gaussian measure μ_s on the Sobolev space $\mathcal{H}^{s+1}(\mathbb{T}^2)$ under $\Phi_{\text{NLW}}(t)$. This Gaussian measure μ_s is *formally* defined by

$$\begin{aligned} d\mu_s &= Z_s^{-1} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\|(u,v)\|^2_{\mathcal{H}^{s+1}}} du dv \\ &= Z_s^{-1} \prod_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^2} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\langle n\rangle^{2(s+1)}|\widehat{u}_n|^2} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\langle n\rangle^{2s}|\widehat{v}_n|^2} d\widehat{u}_n d\widehat{v}_n, \end{aligned} \tag{1.4}$$

where $\widehat{u}_n$ and $\widehat{v}_n$ denote the Fourier transforms of u and v respectively. Note that this measure is naturally associated to the linear wave dynamics. In particular, μ_s is invariant under the linear wave dynamics.

We can define the measure μ_s in a rigorous manner by viewing it as the induced probability measure under the map:

$$\omega \in \Omega \longmapsto (u^\omega, v^\omega),$$

where u^ω and v^ω are given by[1]

$$u^\omega(x) = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^2} \frac{g_n(\omega)}{\langle n\rangle^{s+1}} e^{in\cdot x} \qquad \text{and} \qquad v^\omega(x) = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^2} \frac{h_n(\omega)}{\langle n\rangle^{s}} e^{in\cdot x}. \tag{1.5}$$

Here, $\langle\,\cdot\,\rangle = (1+|\cdot|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\{g_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^2}$, $\{h_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^2}$ are two sequences of "standard independent" complex-valued Gaussian random variables on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ conditioned that $g_n = \overline{g_{-n}}$, $h_n = \overline{h_{-n}}$. More precisely, with the index set Λ defined by

$$\Lambda = (\mathbb{Z}\times\mathbb{Z}_+) \cup (\mathbb{Z}_+ \times \{0\}) \cup \{(0,0)\},$$

we define $\{g_n, h_n\}_{n\in\Lambda}$ to be a sequence of independent standard complex-valued Gaussian random variables (with g_0, h_0 real-valued) and set $g_n = \overline{g_{-n}}$, $h_n = \overline{h_{-n}}$ for $n \in \mathbb{Z}^2$.

The partial sums of the series in (1.5) are a Cauchy sequence in $L^2(\Omega; \mathcal{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^2))$ for every $\sigma < s$ and therefore one can view μ_s as a probability measure on $\mathcal{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^2)$ for a fixed $\sigma < s$. In particular, for $s > 1$, the flow $\Phi_{\text{NLW}}(t)$ is well defined μ_s-almost surely. We also point out that, for the same range of σ, the triplet $\big(\mathcal{H}^{s+1}(\mathbb{T}^2), \mathcal{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^2), \mu_s\big)$ forms an abstract Wiener space. See [8, 11].

We now state our main result.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $s \geq 2$ be an even integer. Then, μ_s is quasi-invariant under $\Phi_{\text{NLW}}(t)$.*

We next consider the defocusing cubic nonlinear Klein-Gordon equation (NLKG):

$$\partial_t^2 u - \Delta u + u + u^3 = 0, \tag{1.6}$$

where $u : \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{T}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$. As for the case of NLW, we rewrite (1.6) as the first order system:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u = v \\ \partial_t v = \Delta u - u - u^3. \end{cases} \tag{1.7}$$

[1]Henceforth, we drop the harmless factor 2π.

The system (1.7) is a Hamiltonian system of PDEs with the Hamiltonian:

$$E(u,v) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \big(u^2 + |\nabla u|^2 + v^2\big)dx + \frac{1}{4}\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} u^4 dx \tag{1.8}$$

and one directly verifies that, if (u,v) is a smooth solution to (1.7), then

$$\frac{d}{dt}E(u(t),v(t)) = 0.$$

We again have that (1.7) is globally well-posed in $\mathcal{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^2)$, $\sigma \geq 1$ (see Lemma 2.1 below). Let us denote this global flow by $\Phi_{\text{NLKG}}(t)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, we have the following statement.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $s \geq 2$ be an even integer. Then, μ_s is quasi-invariant under $\Phi_{\text{NLKG}}(t)$.*

While the proofs of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 are very similar, it is more convenient to first prove Theorem 1.2. Hence, we shall discuss the proof of Theorem 1.2 in details and we will indicate the needed modifications leading to the proof of Theorem 1.1 in the last section of the paper.

1.3. **Remarks & comments.** The restriction that s is an even integer in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 is not essential. We strongly believe that our proof together with some classical (in the field of dispersive PDEs) fractional Leibniz rule considerations provides quasi-invariance of μ_s for every $s \geq 2$. The extension of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 to $s < 2$ may also be tractable by incorporating some of the recent development in the low regularity probabilistic well-posedness of NLW and NLKG.[2] In order to highlight our renormalization argument, we decided not to pursue these extensions here. Similarly, we believe that our argument is applicable to the defocusing nonlinearities of higher degrees. For the conciseness of the presentation, however, we only work with the cubic nonlinearity.

In [16, 13], we studied the cubic fourth order nonlinear Schrödinger equation on the circle:

$$i\partial_t u = \partial_x^4 u + |u|^2 u$$

and proved quasi-invariance of the Gaussian measure θ_s on $L^2(\mathbb{T})$ formally defined by

$$d\theta_s = Z_s^{-1} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\|u\|_{H^s}^2} du = Z_s^{-1} \prod_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\langle n\rangle^{2s}|\widehat{u}_n|^2} d\widehat{u}_n,$$

provided that $s > \frac{1}{2}$. In [13], we also showed that the dispersion is essential for this quasi-invariance result. More precisely, we considered the following dispersionless model on $\mathbb{T}$:

$$i\partial_t u = |u|^2 u \tag{1.9}$$

and showed that the Gaussian measure θ_s is *not* quasi-invariant under the flow of (1.9). In a similar manner, we believe that the dispersive term is crucial in order to establish a quasi-invariance result in Theorem 1.1, no matter how large s is. It is quite likely that the method of [13] can be adapted to show that the transport of μ_s under the (well defined) flow of

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u = v \\ \partial_t v = -u^3 \end{cases} \tag{1.10}$$

[2]For example, the work [15] on the invariant Gibbs measure for the 2-d NLKG implies quasi-invariance of μ_0 under the renormalized NLKG dynamics. For μ_s with $s > 0$, one should not need the renormalized equation.

is not equivalent to μ_s (for non-trivial times). Indeed, we expect that the flow of (1.10) introduces fast time oscillations, modifying some fine regularity properties which hold true typically with respect to the Gaussian measure μ_s.

As it is well known, the solutions to NLW can be decomposed as the linear evolution plus a "one-derivative smoother term". On the other hand, the typical Sobolev regularity on the support of μ_s is $\mathcal{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^2)$, $\sigma < s$. The Cameron-Martin theorem in this context states that for a fixed $(h_1, h_2) \in \mathcal{H}^{\sigma+1}(\mathbb{T}^2)$, the transport of μ_s under the shift

$$(u, v) \longmapsto (u, v) + (h_1, h_2)$$

is a singular with respect to the original measure μ_s. Therefore, the results in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 represent remarkable statements, displaying fine properties of the vector fields generating $\Phi_{\mathrm{NLW}}(t)$ and $\Phi_{\mathrm{NLKG}}(t)$. Moreover, we believe that the results of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 are completely out of reach of Ramer's result [18] for which we would need $(2+\varepsilon)$-smoothing on the nonlinear term. See [16, 23] for further discussion on this topic.

According to [2], Gel'fand asked whether, in the context of Gibbs measures for Hamiltonian PDEs, one may show the quasi-invariance of the corresponding Wiener measure by a direct method. Our result gives some light on Gel'fand's question because now we have a method to directly prove quasi-invariance of a large class of Gaussian measures supported by functions of varying regularities for the nonlinear wave equations. We should also admit that our present understanding of the corresponding question for the (more complicated) nonlinear Schrödinger equations is quite poor.

Our main results state that the transported measure $\mu_s^t := \Phi_{\mathrm{NLW}}(t)_*\mu_s$ by $\Phi_{\mathrm{NLW}}(t)$ (or $\Phi_{\mathrm{NLKG}}(t)$) is absolutely continuous with respect to μ_s. Therefore, it has a well defined Radon-Nikodym derivative $f(t, u, v) := \frac{d\mu_s^t}{d\mu_s}(u, v) \in L^1(d\mu_s)$. It would be very interesting to obtain some further properties of the densities $f(t, u, v)$. As a byproduct of our analysis, one may hope to obtain a higher integrability: $f(t, u, v) \in L^p(d\mu_s(u, v))$, $p < \infty$. It also seems of interest to establish some compactness properties in t of $f(t, u, v)$ and to study the time averages of $f(t, u, v)$.

Lastly, let us point out the following consequence of our quasi-invariance results. Let $(u(0), v(0))$ be initial data distributed according to the Gaussian measure μ_s. Then, it follows from the Gaussian nature of the initial data that $(u(0), v(0))$ belongs to any Sobolev spaces $W^{\sigma,p}(\mathbb{T}^2)$, $p \leq \infty$, and also to Hölder spaces $\mathcal{C}^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^2) = B^\sigma_{\infty,\infty}(\mathbb{T}^2)$, provided that $\sigma < s$. Then, the quasi-invariance of μ_s guarantees that the additional regularity of the global solution $(u(t), v(t))$ that it belongs to the same Sobolev and Hölder spaces for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, almost surely. Such propagation of Sobolev and Hölder regularities for general dispersive PDEs seems to be beyond deterministic analysis at this point.

1.4. **Renormalized energy.** We now derive the renormalized energies associated to NLKG (1.7). As already mentioned, these renormalized energy and the related energy estimates are the main novelty of this work. Such type of renormalizations usually appears in the context of low regularity solutions. We find it interesting that, in our problem, even for large s (very regular solutions), we are obliged to appeal to a renormalization in constructing a modified energy. The analysis of the Benjamin-Ono equation [24] is another example, where we need to use renormalizations even for regular solutions, but in a much more perturbative manner as compared to the analysis in this paper.

In the study of the transport of μ_s under the flow of (1.7), we pass to the limit $N \to \infty$ in the truncated model:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u = v \\ \partial_t v = \Delta u - u - \pi_N((\pi_N u)^3), \end{cases} \tag{1.11}$$

where π_N denotes the Dirichlet projector onto the frequencies $\{|n| \leq N\}$. Then, it is easy to see that the low frequency part $E(\pi_N u, \pi_N v)$ of the energy and the truncated energy:

$$\begin{aligned} E_N(u,v) &= \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \big(u^2 + |\nabla u|^2 + v^2\big)dx + \frac{1}{4}\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (\pi_N u)^4 dx \\ &= E(\pi_N u, \pi_N v) + \|(\pi_N^\perp u, \pi_N^\perp v)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 \end{aligned} \tag{1.12}$$

are conserved under the flow of (1.11), where $\pi_N^\perp = \mathrm{Id} - \pi_N$. Therefore, as in the case of the untruncated NLKG (1.7), the Cauchy problem for (1.11) is still globally well-posed in $\mathcal{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^2)$, $\sigma \geq 1$.

Denote $\pi_N u$ and $\pi_N v$ by u_N and v_N, respectively. Taking into account the definition (1.4) of the Gaussian measure μ_s, it is natural to study the expression

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\|(u_N(t), v_N(t))\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s+1}}^2,$$

where (u,v) is a solution to the truncated NLKG (1.11). A direct computation yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\|(u_N(t), v_N(t))\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s+1}}^2 &= \partial_t\bigg[\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{T}^2}(J^s v_N)^2 + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{T}^2}(J^{s+1}u_N)^2\bigg] \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^2}(J^{2s}v_N)(-u_N^3), \end{aligned} \tag{1.13}$$

where

$$J := \sqrt{1-\Delta}.$$

In particular, when $s = 0$, the term on the right-hand side is

$$-\frac{1}{4}\partial_t\bigg[\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} u_N^4\bigg]$$

and thus we recover the conservation of (the low frequency part of) the energy $E(u_N, v_N)$.

Let $s \geq 2$ be an even integer. By the Leibniz rule, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{T}^2}(J^{2s}v_N)(-u_N^3) = -3\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} J^s v_N J^s u_N \, u_N^2 \\ + \sum_{\substack{|\alpha|+|\beta|+|\gamma|\leq s \\ |\alpha|,|\beta|,|\gamma|<s}} c_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} J^s v_N \cdot \partial^\alpha u_N \cdot \partial^\beta u_N \cdot \partial^\gamma u_N \end{aligned} \tag{1.14}$$

for some inessential constants $c_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}$. Furthermore, recalling that $\mathrm{vol}(\mathbb{T}^2) = 1$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} -3\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} J^s v_N J^s u_N \, u_N^2 &= -\frac{3}{2}\partial_t\bigg[\int_{\mathbb{T}^2}(J^s u_N)^2 u_N^2\bigg] + 3\int_{\mathbb{T}^2}(J^s u_N)^2 \, v_N u_N \\ &= -\frac{3}{2}\partial_t\bigg[\int_{\mathbb{T}^2}\mathbf{P}_{\neq 0}[(J^s u_N)^2]\,\mathbf{P}_{\neq 0}[u_N^2]\bigg] + 3\int_{\mathbb{T}^2}\mathbf{P}_{\neq 0}[(J^s u_N)^2]\,\mathbf{P}_{\neq 0}[v_N u_N] \\ &\quad - \frac{3}{2}\partial_t\bigg[\int_{\mathbb{T}^2}(J^s u_N)^2\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} u_N^2\bigg] + 3\int_{\mathbb{T}^2}(J^s u_N)^2\int v_N u_N, \end{aligned} \tag{1.15}$$

where $\mathbf{P}_{\neq 0}$ is the projection onto non-zero frequencies: $\mathbf{P}_{\neq 0} f := f - \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} f$. Here, the last two terms[3] on the right-hand side of (1.15) are problematic because, in view of (1.5), we have

$$\sigma_N := \mathbb{E}_{\mu_s}\bigg[\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (J^s u_N)^2\bigg] = \sum_{\substack{n\in\mathbb{Z}^2\\ |n|\leq N}} \frac{1}{\langle n\rangle^2} \sim \log N \longrightarrow \infty \tag{1.16}$$

as $N\to\infty$ (one may also show that we have an almost sure divergence). Therefore, we need to introduce a suitable renormalization to treat the difficulty both at the level of the $\mathcal{H}^{s+1}$-energy functional and its time derivative at the same time.

With σ_N defined above, we can rewrite the last two terms on the right-hand side of (1.15) as

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{3}{2}\partial_t\bigg[\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (J^s u_N)^2 \int u_N^2\bigg] + 3\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (J^s u_N)^2 \int v_N u_N \\ = -\frac{3}{2}\partial_t\bigg[\bigg(\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (J^s u_N)^2 - \sigma_N\bigg)\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} u_N^2\bigg] + 3\bigg(\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (J^s u_N)^2 - \sigma_N\bigg)\int v_N u_N. \end{aligned} \tag{1.17}$$

Note that the term

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (J^s u_N)^2 - \sigma_N$$

is now a "good" term since, as we shall see below, we have

$$\bigg\| \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (J^s \pi_N u)^2 - \sigma_N \bigg\|_{L^p(d\mu_s(u,v))} \leq Cp,$$

for any finite $p\geq 2$, where the constant $C>0$ is independent of p and N. In view of the above discussion, it is now natural to define the *renormalized energy* $E_{s,N}(u,v)$ by

$$E_{s,N}(u,v) = \frac{1}{2}\int (J^s v)^2 + \frac{1}{2}\int (J^{s+1}u)^2 + \frac{3}{2}\int (J^s \pi_N u)^2 (\pi_N u)^2 - \frac{3}{2}\sigma_N \int (\pi_N u)^2. \tag{1.18}$$

By writing $E_{s,N}(u,v)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} E_{s,N}(u,v) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (J^s v)^2 + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (J^{s+1}u)^2 + \frac{3}{2}\int \mathbf{P}_{\neq 0}[(J^s u_N)^2]\, \mathbf{P}_{\neq 0}[u_N^2] \\ + \frac{3}{2}\bigg(\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (J^s u_N)^2 - \sigma_N\bigg)\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} u_N^2, \end{aligned} \tag{1.19}$$

it follows from (1.13), (1.14), (1.15), and (1.17) that, if (u,v) is a solution to (1.11), then

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t E_{s,N}(u_N, v_N) = 3\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \mathbf{P}_{\neq 0}[(J^s u_N)^2]\, \mathbf{P}_{\neq 0}[v_N u_N] + 3\bigg(\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (J^s u_N)^2 - \sigma_N\bigg)\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} v_N u_N \\ + \sum_{\substack{|\alpha|+|\beta|+|\gamma|\leq s\\ |\alpha|,|\beta|,|\gamma|<s}} c_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} J^s v_N \cdot \partial^\alpha u_N \cdot \partial^\beta u_N \cdot \partial^\gamma u_N. \end{aligned} \tag{1.20}$$

Now all terms on the right-hand side of (1.20) are suitable for a perturbative analysis. Here is the precise statement.

[3]Namely, we have issues at the level of *both* the energy and its time derivative.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $s \geq 2$ be an even integer and let us denote by $\Phi_N(t)$ the flow of (1.11). Then, given $r > 0$, there is a constant C such that*

$$\left\{ \int_{\{E_N(u,v)\leq r\}} \left| \partial_t E_{s,N}(\pi_N \Phi_N(t)(u,v))|_{t=0} \right|^p d\mu_s(u,v) \right\}^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq Cp$$

for every $p \geq 2$ and every $N \in \mathbb{N}$.

This probabilistic energy estimate on the renormalized energy $E_{s,N}$ is the main novelty of this paper. We will present the proof of Theorem 1.3 in Section 4.

Remark 1.4. It is worthwhile to note that the introduction of the renormalization at the level of the energy also introduces a renormalization at the level of the time derivative of the energy. Namely, by the argument above, we renormalized both the $\mathcal{H}^{s+1}$-energy functional and its time derivative at the same time. See (1.17), (1.19), and (1.20).

Remark 1.5. Consider the following dispersion generalized NLKG:

$$\partial_t^2 u + J^{2\beta} u + u^3 = 0 \tag{1.21}$$

for $\beta > 1$. With $v = \partial_t u$, we can rewrite (1.21) as

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u = v \\ \partial_t v = -J^{2\beta} u - u^3. \end{cases} \tag{1.22}$$

For this equation, we define the Gaussian measure μ_s^β by

$$d\mu_s^\beta = Z_{s,\beta}^{-1} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\int (J^{s+\beta}u)^2 - \frac{1}{2}\int (J^s v)^2} du dv.$$

Then, a typical element (u^ω, v^ω) is given by the following random Fourier series:

$$u^\omega(x) = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^2} \frac{g_n(\omega)}{\langle n\rangle^{s+\beta}} e^{in\cdot x} \qquad \text{and} \qquad v^\omega(x) = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^2} \frac{h_n(\omega)}{\langle n\rangle^{s}} e^{in\cdot x},$$

where $\{g_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^2}$ and $\{h_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^2}$ are as in (1.5). Then, it is easy to see that (u^ω, v^ω) belongs to

$$H^{s+\beta-1-\varepsilon}(\mathbb{T}^2) \times H^{s-1-\varepsilon}(\mathbb{T}^2)$$

almost surely for any $\varepsilon > 0$. In particular, for $\beta > 1$, we have $u \in H^s(\mathbb{T}^2)$ almost surely. In fact, we have $u \in W^{s,p}(\mathbb{T}^2)$ for any $p \leq \infty$ almost surely. This implies that $\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (J^s u)^2 u^2 < \infty$ almost surely and hence there is no need to introduce a renormalized energy. See Appendix A.

Therefore, when $\beta > 1$, one can proceed as in [23] and prove quasi-invariance of μ_s^β under the flow of the dispersion generalized NLKG (1.21). In particular, when $\beta = 2$, (1.21) corresponds to the nonlinear beam equation on $\mathbb{T}^2$, which is the borderline case for Ramer's argument on $\mathbb{T}^2$ (namely, still non-trivial). The same remark applies to the dispersion generalized NLW:

$$\partial_t^2 u + (-\Delta)^\beta u + u^3 = 0.$$

1.5. **Organization of the remaining part of the manuscript.** We complete this section by introducing some notations. In the next section, we present the well known arguments assuring the existence of well-defined dynamics in $\mathcal{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^2)$, $\sigma \geq 1$. In Section 3, we define a weighted Gaussian measure absolutely continuous with respect to μ_s. This weighted Gaussian measure is adapted to the renormalized energy $E_{s,N}$ and its transport with respect to the truncated NLKG dynamics $\Phi_N(t)$ is easier to handle. Section 4 will be devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.3. In Section 5, we employ the arguments essentially introduced in our previous works [23, 16] to complete the proof of Theorem 1.2 for NLKG. The last section is devoted to the extension of Theorem 1.2 to the case of the "usual" nonlinear wave equation (Theorem 1.1). In Appendix A, we briefly discuss the case of the dispersion generalized NLKG.

1.6. **Notation.** For a multi-index $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^2_{\geq 0}$, we set $|\alpha| = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2$. For a frequency $n = (n_1, n_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, we set $|n| = (n_1^2 + n_2^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\langle n \rangle = (1 + n_1^2 + n_2^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

Given $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote the projectors $\mathbf{P}_N$ and π_N by

$$(\mathbf{P}_N u)(x) = \sum_{N \leq \langle n \rangle < 2N} \widehat{u}_n \, e^{in\cdot x}$$

and

$$(\pi_N u)(x) = \sum_{|n| \leq N} \widehat{u}_n \, e^{in\cdot x}.$$

We also set

$$\pi_N^\perp = \mathrm{Id} - \pi_N.$$

We will consider the Littlewood-Paley decomposition of the form

$$u = \sum_{N \geq 1, \, \text{dyadic}} \mathbf{P}_N u.$$

Given $r > 0$, we define $\mu_{s,N,r}$ as

$$d\mu_{s,N,r}(u,v) = \mathbf{1}_{\{E_N(u,v) \leq r\}} \, d\mu_s(u,v), \tag{1.23}$$

where $E_N(u,v)$ is the conserved energy for the truncated NLKG dynamics defined in (1.12). We also set $\mu_{s,r} = \mu_{s,\infty,r}$.

Given $R > 0$ and $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$, we define the ball $B_{R,\sigma} \subset \mathcal{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^2)$ by

$$B_{R,\sigma} = \big\{(u,v) \in \mathcal{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^2) \, : \, \|(u,v)\|_{\mathcal{H}^\sigma} \leq R\big\}.$$

2. On the well-posedness and approximation property of the truncated NLKG dynamics

In this section, we briefly go over the well-posedness theory of the following Cauchy problem for the truncated NLKG:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u = v \\ \partial_t v = \Delta u - u - \pi_N((\pi_N u)^3) \\ (u,v)|_{t=0} = (u_0, v_0), \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

where $N \geq 1$. We also allow $N = \infty$ with the convention $\pi_\infty = \mathrm{Id}$. We have the following (well-known) result.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\sigma \geq 1$ and $N \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$. Then, the truncated NLKG (2.1) is globally well-posed in $\mathcal{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^2)$. Namely, given any $(u_0, v_0) \in \mathcal{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^2)$, there exists a unique global solution to (2.1) in $C(\mathbb{R}; \mathcal{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^2))$ and, moreover, the dependence on initial data is continuous. If we denote by $\Phi_N(t)$ the data-to-solution map at time t, then $\Phi_N(t)$ is a continuous bijection on $\mathcal{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^2)$ for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$, satisfying the semigroup property:*

$$\Phi_N(t+\tau) = \Phi_N(t) \circ \Phi_N(\tau)$$

for any $t, \tau \in \mathbb{R}$.

When $N = \infty$, we simply denote $\Phi_\infty(t) = \Phi_{\text{NLKG}}(t)$ by $\Phi(t)$ in the following.

Proof. By rewriting (2.1) in the Duhamel formulation, we have

$$(u(t), v(t)) = \bar{S}(t)(u_0, v_0) + \big(F_1(u)(t), F_2(u)(t)\big), \tag{2.2}$$

where

$$\bar{S}(t)(u_0, v_0) = (S(t)(u_0, v_0), \partial_t S(t)(u_0, v_0))$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} S(t)(u_0, v_0) &= \cos(tJ)u_0 + J^{-1}\sin(tJ)v_0, \\ \partial_t S(t)(u_0, v_0) &= -J\sin(tJ)u_0 + \cos(tJ)v_0, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} F_1(u)(t) &= -\int_0^t J^{-1}\sin((t-\tau)J)\,\pi_N\big((\pi_N u)^3\big)(\tau)d\tau, \\ F_2(u)(t) &= -\int_0^t \cos((t-\tau)J)\,\pi_N\big((\pi_N u)^3\big)(\tau)d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

By a fixed point argument with the Sobolev embedding, one can easily solve (2.2) locally in time in $C([-T, T]; \mathcal{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^2))$ for some small $T = T\big(\|(u_0, v_0)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}\big) > 0$. This claim immediately follows from the boundedness (in fact, unitarity) of $\bar{S}(t)$ on $\mathcal{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^2)$ for all $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$ and

$$\big\|\big(F_1(u)(t), F_2(u)(t)\big)\big\|_{\mathcal{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^2)} \lesssim \|u\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^2)}\|u\|^2_{H^1(\mathbb{T}^2)} \tag{2.3}$$

for any $\sigma \geq 1$. The tame estimate (2.3) is a consequence of the fractional Leibniz rule:

$$\|J^\sigma(u^3)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} \lesssim \|J^\sigma u\|_{L^6(\mathbb{T}^2)}\|u\|^2_{L^6(\mathbb{T}^2)}$$

and the Sobolev embedding $H^1(\mathbb{T}^2) \subset L^6(\mathbb{T}^2)$ and ensures that the local existence time depends only on $\|(u_0, v_0)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}$. The conservation of the truncated energy $E_N(u, v)$ defined in (1.12) provides an a priori bound on $\|(u(t), v(t))\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}$, allowing us to iterate the local existence result and extend the local solutions globally in time. The flow properties are a standard consequence of the time reversibility of (2.1). This completes the proof of Lemma 2.1. □

Remark 2.2. Note that Lemma 2.1 also holds in the three-dimensional case because we also have the Sobolev embedding $H^1(\mathbb{T}^3) \subset L^6(\mathbb{T}^3)$.

We also have the following approximation property of the truncated dynamics (2.1).

Lemma 2.3. *Let $\sigma \geq 1$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, and K be a compact set in $\mathcal{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^2)$. Then, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that*

$$\|\Phi(t)(u,v) - \Phi_N(t)(u,v)\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^2)} < \varepsilon$$

for any $(u,v) \in K$ and any $N \geq N_0$ and hence

$$\Phi(t)(K) \subset \Phi_N(t)(K + B_{\varepsilon,\sigma}).$$

for any $N \geq N_0$.

The proof of Lemma 2.3 is based on the identity

$$u^3 - \pi_N\big((\pi_N u)^3\big) = \pi_N^\perp(u^3) + \pi_N\big(u^3 - (\pi_N u)^3\big)$$

and the estimates in the proof of Lemma 2.1. In our previous works [23, 16], we presented the details of the approximation argument analogous to Lemma 2.3 and thus we omit details.

3. Weighted Gaussian measure associated to the renormalized energy

In this section, we construct a weighted Gaussian measure $\rho_{s,N,r}$ associated to the renormalized energy $E_{s,N}$ introduced in Subsection 1.4. We will study its transport properties in Section 5.

Let $r > 0$ and $N \geq 1$. In view of (1.4) and (1.18), we define a weighted Gaussian measure $\rho_{s,N,r}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} d\rho_{s,N,r}(u,v) &= \text{“}Z_{s,N,r}^{-1}\mathbf{1}_{\{E_N(u,v)\leq r\}}e^{-E_{s,N}(u,v)}dudv\text{”} \\ &= Z_{s,N,r}^{-1}\mathbf{1}_{\{E_N(u,v)\leq r\}}e^{-R_{s,N}(\pi_N u)}d\mu_s(u,v), \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

where $E_N(u,v)$ is the conserved energy for the truncated NLKG defined in (1.12) and $R_{s,N}(u)$ is defined by

$$R_{s,N}(u) = \frac{3}{2}\int_{\mathbb{T}^2}(J^s u)^2 u^2 - \frac{3}{2}\sigma_N \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} u^2. \tag{3.2}$$

Our goal in this section is to prove the following statement.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $s > 0$ and $r > 0$. Then, given $p < \infty$, there exists $C > 0$ such that*

$$\Big\|\mathbf{1}_{\{E_N(u,v)\leq r\}}e^{-R_{s,N}(\pi_N u)}\Big\|_{L^p(d\mu_s(u,v))} \leq C \tag{3.3}$$

for every $N \geq 1$. Moreover, there exists $R_s(u) \in L^p(d\mu_s(u,v))$ such that

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} R_{s,N}(\pi_N u) = R_s(u) \qquad \text{in } L^p(d\mu_s(u,v)) \tag{3.4}$$

and

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \mathbf{1}_{\{E_N(u,v)\leq r\}}e^{-R_{s,N}(\pi_N u)} = \mathbf{1}_{\{E(u,v)\leq r\}}e^{-R_s(u)} \qquad \text{in } L^p(d\mu_s(u,v)). \tag{3.5}$$

Proposition 3.1 allows us to define the limiting weighted Gaussian measure $\rho_{s,r}$ by

$$d\rho_{s,r}(u,v) = Z_{s,r}^{-1}\mathbf{1}_{\{E(u,v)\leq r\}}e^{-R_s(u)}d\mu_s(u,v). \tag{3.6}$$

Moreover, we have the following ‘uniform convergence’ property of $\rho_{s,N,r}$ to $\rho_{s,r}$; given any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$|\rho_{s,r}(A) - \rho_{s,N,r}(A)| < \varepsilon \tag{3.7}$$

for any $N \geq N_0$ and any measurable set $A \subset \mathcal{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^2)$, $\sigma < s$.

In the following, we first state several lemmas. We then present the proof of Proposition 3.1 at the end of this section. We first recall the following Wiener chaos estimate [19, Theorem I.22]. See also [20, Proposition 2.4].

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\{g_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of independent standard real-valued Gaussian random variables. Given $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\{P_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of polynomials in $\bar{g} = \{g_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of degree at most k. Then, for $p \geq 2$, we have*

$$\Big\| \sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} P_j(\bar{g}) \Big\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq (p-1)^{\frac{k}{2}} \Big\| \sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} P_j(\bar{g}) \Big\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

This lemma is a direct corollary to the hypercontractivity of the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroup due to Nelson [12]. We use Lemma 3.2 to prove the following two lemmas. The first lemma is a direct consequence of the linear Gaussian bound and will be used in Section 4.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $s > 1$. Let α, β be multi-indices such that $|\alpha| \leq s$ and $|\beta| \leq s-1$. Then, for every $\delta > 0$, there exists $C > 0$ such that*

$$\big\| \|\partial^\alpha \mathbf{P}_M \pi_N u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^2)} \big\|_{L^p(d\mu_s(u,v))} \leq C\sqrt{p} M^\delta, \tag{3.8}$$

$$\big\| \|\partial^\beta \mathbf{P}_M \pi_N v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^2)} \big\|_{L^p(d\mu_s(u,v))} \leq C\sqrt{p} M^\delta, \tag{3.9}$$

for any $p \geq 2$ and any $N, M \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. In the following, we only prove (3.8) since (3.9) follows in a similar manner. Let $q \gg 1$ be such that $q > 2/\delta$. Then, by the Sobolev embedding $W^{\delta,q}(\mathbb{T}^2) \subset L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^2)$, it suffices to prove the bound

$$\big\| \|J^\delta \partial^\alpha \mathbf{P}_M \pi_N u\|_{L^q(\mathbb{T}^2)} \big\|_{L^p(d\mu_s(u,v))} \leq C\sqrt{p} M^\delta.$$

Without loss of generality, assume $p \geq q$. By Minkowski's inequality, we see that it suffices to prove

$$\big\| \|J^\delta \partial^\alpha \mathbf{P}_M \pi_N u\|_{L^p(d\mu_s(u,v))} \big\|_{L^q(\mathbb{T}^2)} \leq C\sqrt{p} M^\delta. \tag{3.10}$$

Noting that

$$\|J^\delta \partial^\alpha \mathbf{P}_M \pi_N u\|_{L^p(d\mu_s(u,v))} = \Big\| \sum_{\substack{M\leq\langle n\rangle<2M \\ |n|\leq N}} \frac{(in)^\alpha \langle n\rangle^\delta g_n}{\langle n\rangle^{s+1}} e^{in\cdot x} \Big\|_{L^p(\Omega)},$$

it follows from Lemma 3.2 that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Big\| \sum_{\substack{M\leq\langle n\rangle<2M \\ |n|\leq N}} \frac{(in)^\alpha \langle n\rangle^\delta g_n}{\langle n\rangle^{s+1}} e^{in\cdot x} \Big\|_{L^p(\Omega)} &\leq \sqrt{p} \Big\| \sum_{\substack{M\leq\langle n\rangle<2M \\ |n|\leq N}} \frac{(in)^\alpha \langle n\rangle^\delta g_n}{\langle n\rangle^{s+1}} e^{in\cdot x} \Big\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&= \sqrt{p} \Big(\sum_{\substack{M\leq\langle n\rangle<2M \\ |n|\leq N}} \frac{|n|^{2|\alpha|}\langle n\rangle^{2\delta}}{\langle n\rangle^{2(s+1)}} \Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C\sqrt{p} M^\delta,
\end{aligned}$$

yielding (3.10). This completes the proof of Lemma 3.3. □

Set

$$F_N(u) \equiv R_{s,N}(\pi_N u). \tag{3.11}$$

The following lemma on the convergence property of $F_N(u)$ is inspired by the consideration in [1]. Similar analysis also appears in the quantum field theory literature.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $s > 0$. Then, there exist $\theta > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that*

$$\|F_N(u) - F_M(u)\|_{L^p(d\mu_s(u,v))} \leq Cp^2 M^{-\theta}$$

for any $N \geq M \geq 1$ and any $p \geq 2$.

Remark 3.5. As a corollary to Lemma 3.4, we have the following tail estimate:

$$\mu_s\big((u,v) : |F_N(u) - F_M(u)| > \alpha\big) \leq Ce^{-cM^{\frac{\theta}{2}}\alpha^{\frac{1}{2}}},$$

which follows from Lemma 3.4 and Chebyshev's inequality. See also [21, Lemma 4.5].

Proof. Write

$$\frac{3}{2}\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (J^s \pi_N u)^2 (\pi_N u)^2 = \frac{3}{2}\sum_{\Gamma_N} \langle n_1\rangle^s \langle n_2\rangle^s \, \widehat{u}_{n_1}\widehat{u}_{n_2}\widehat{u}_{n_3}\widehat{u}_{n_4}. \tag{3.12}$$

where Γ_N is defined by

$$\Gamma_N = \big\{(n_1,n_2,n_3,n_4) \in \mathbb{Z}^4 : n_1+n_2+n_3+n_4 = 0, |n_j| \leq N\big\}.$$

We say that we have a *pair* if we have $n_j = -n_k$, $j \neq k$ in the summation above. Under the condition $n_1+n_2+n_3+n_4 = 0$, we have either two pairs or no pair. We now split the summation in three cases. (i) The first contribution comes from the case

$$\Lambda_1 = \Gamma_N \cap \{n_1 = -n_2\},$$

(ii) the second contribution comes from

$$\Lambda_2 = \Gamma_N \cap \{n_1 = -n_3 \text{ or } n_1 = -n_4 \text{ but } n_1 \neq -n_2\},$$

and (iii) the third contribution comes from the "no pair" case:

$$\Lambda_3 = \Gamma_N \cap \{n_1 \neq -n_j, j = 2,3,4\}.$$

Therefore, recalling that $\widehat{u}_{-n} = \overline{\widehat{u}_n}$, we have the decomposition

$$\frac{3}{2}\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (J^s \pi_N u)^2 (\pi_N u)^2 = J_{1,N}(u) + J_{2,N}(u) + J_{3,N}(u),$$

where $J_{j,N}(u)$, $j = 1,2,3$, is the contribution to (3.12) from Λ_j, satisfying

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{1,N}(u) &= \frac{3}{2}\Big(\sum_{|n|\leq N} \langle n\rangle^{2s}|\widehat{u}_n|^2\Big)\Big(\sum_{|n|\leq N}|\widehat{u}_n|^2\Big),\\
J_{2,N}(u) &= 3\sum_{|n|\leq N}\langle n\rangle^s|\widehat{u}_n|^2\Big(\sum_{\substack{|m|\leq N\\ m\neq n}}\langle m\rangle^s|\widehat{u}_m|^2\Big) - \frac{3}{2}\sum_{\substack{|n|\leq N\\ n\neq 0}}\langle n\rangle^{2s}|\widehat{u}_n|^4,\\
J_{3,N}(u) &= \frac{3}{2}\sum_{\Lambda_3}\langle n_1\rangle^s\langle n_2\rangle^s \widehat{u}_{n_1}\widehat{u}_{n_2}\widehat{u}_{n_3}\widehat{u}_{n_4}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

Note that the first term in (3.13) corresponds to the contribution from

$$\{n_1 = -n_j \text{ but } n_1 \neq -n_2\}, \quad j = 3, 4.$$

We, however, needed to subtract the contribution from

$$\{n_1 = -n_3 = -n_4 \text{ but } n_1 \neq -n_2\},$$

which was counted twice. This corresponds to the second term in (3.13). Note that we need the restriction $n \neq 0$ since $n_1 \neq -n_2$.

Now, by setting

$$\widetilde{J}_{1,N}(u) = J_{1,N}(u) - \frac{3}{2}\sigma_N \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (\pi_N u)^2 = \frac{3}{2}\Big(\Big(\sum_{|n|\leq N} \langle n\rangle^{2s} |\widehat{u}_n|^2 \Big) - \sigma_N \Big) \Big(\sum_{|n|\leq N} |\widehat{u}_n|^2 \Big),$$

it suffices to prove the following three estimates:

$$\big\| \widetilde{J}_{1,N}(u^\omega) - \widetilde{J}_{1,M}(u^\omega) \big\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \lesssim p^2 M^{-\theta}, \tag{3.14}$$

$$\big\| J_{2,N}(u^\omega) - J_{2,M}(u^\omega) \big\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \lesssim p^2 M^{-\theta}, \tag{3.15}$$

$$\big\| J_{3,N}(u^\omega) - J_{3,M}(u^\omega) \big\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \lesssim p^2 M^{-\theta}, \tag{3.16}$$

where u^ω is as in (1.5).

With the definition (1.16) of σ_N, the left-hand side of (3.14) equals

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{3}{2} \Big\| \Big(\sum_{|n|\leq N} \frac{|g_n|^2 - 1}{\langle n\rangle^2} \Big) \Big(\sum_{|n|\leq N} \frac{|g_n|^2}{\langle n\rangle^{2(s+1)}} \Big) \\ - \Big(\sum_{|n|\leq M} \frac{|g_n|^2 - 1}{\langle n\rangle^2} \Big) \Big(\sum_{|n|\leq M} \frac{|g_n|^2}{\langle n\rangle^{2(s+1)}} \Big) \Big\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

Then, with

$$A_N B_N - A_M B_M = (A_N - A_M) B_N + A_M (B_N - B_M), \tag{3.18}$$

we can estimate (3.17) by

$$\begin{aligned} C \Big\| \Big(\sum_{M<|n|\leq N} \frac{|g_n|^2 - 1}{\langle n\rangle^2} \Big) \Big(\sum_{|n|\leq N} \frac{|g_n|^2}{\langle n\rangle^{2(s+1)}} \Big) \Big\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \\ + C \Big\| \Big(\sum_{|n|\leq N} \frac{|g_n(\omega)|^2 - 1}{\langle n\rangle^2} \Big) \Big(\sum_{M<|n|\leq N} \frac{|g_n(\omega)|^2}{\langle n\rangle^{2(s+1)}} \Big) \Big\|_{L^p(\Omega)} =: \mathrm{I} + \mathrm{II}. \end{aligned}$$

We now estimate I and II. By Hölder's inequality, Lemma 3.2, and the triangle inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{I} &\lesssim \Big\| \sum_{M<|n|\leq N} \frac{|g_n|^2 - 1}{\langle n\rangle^2} \Big\|_{L^{2p}(\Omega)} \Big\| \sum_{|n|\leq N} \frac{|g_n|^2}{\langle n\rangle^{2(s+1)}} \Big\|_{L^{2p}(\Omega)} \\ &\lesssim p \Big\| \sum_{M<|n|\leq N} \frac{|g_n|^2 - 1}{\langle n\rangle^2} \Big\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \sum_{|n|\leq N} \frac{\|g_n\|^2_{L^{4p}(\Omega)}}{\langle n\rangle^{2(s+1)}}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

Noting that $\|g_n\|_{L^{4p}(\Omega)} \lesssim \sqrt{p}$ and

$$\mathbb{E}\big[(|g_n|^2 - 1)(|g_m|^2 - 1)\big] = \delta_{nm}, \tag{3.20}$$

we obtain

$$\mathrm{I} \lesssim p^2 \Big(\sum_{M<|n|\leq N} \frac{1}{\langle n\rangle^4} \Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Big(\sum_{|n|\leq N} \frac{1}{\langle n\rangle^{2(s+1)}} \Big) \lesssim p^2 M^{-1}. \tag{3.21}$$

Next, we estimate II. Proceeding as above, we obtain

$$\mathrm{II} \lesssim p^2 \Big(\sum_{|n|\leq N} \frac{1}{\langle n\rangle^4} \Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Big(\sum_{M<|n|\leq N} \frac{1}{\langle n\rangle^{2(s+1)}} \Big) \lesssim p^2 M^{-s}. \tag{3.22}$$

Hence, (3.14) follows from (3.21) and (3.22) provided that $\theta < \min(1, s)$.

Let us next turn to the proof of (3.15). By the triangle inequality, $\|g_n\|_{L^{4p}(\Omega)} \lesssim \sqrt{p}$, and (3.18), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LHS of (3.15)} &\lesssim p^2 \bigg\{ \Big(\sum_{M<|n|\leq N} \frac{1}{\langle n\rangle^{s+2}} \Big) \Big(\sum_{|n|\leq N} \frac{1}{\langle n\rangle^{s+2}} \Big) + \sum_{M<|n|\leq N} \frac{1}{\langle n\rangle^{2s+4}} \bigg\} \\ &\leq C p^2 M^{-s}, \end{aligned}$$

provided that $s > 0$. This proves (3.15).

Let us finally turn to (3.16). In this case, it suffices to prove

$$\Big\| \sum_{\substack{\Lambda_3 \\ \max |n_j|>M}} \frac{g_{n_1} g_{n_2} g_{n_3} g_{n_4}}{\langle n_1\rangle \langle n_2\rangle \langle n_3\rangle^{s+1} \langle n_4\rangle^{s+1}} \Big\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \lesssim p^2 M^{-\theta}. \tag{3.23}$$

By Lemma 3.2, the left-hand side of (3.23) is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & p^2 \Big\| \sum_{\substack{\Lambda_3 \\ \max |n_j|>M}} \frac{g_{n_1} g_{n_2} g_{n_3} g_{n_4}}{\langle n_1\rangle \langle n_2\rangle \langle n_3\rangle^{s+1} \langle n_4\rangle^{s+1}} \Big\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &= p^2 \, \mathbb{E} \bigg[\Big(\sum_{\substack{\Lambda_3 \\ \max |n_j|>M}} \frac{g_{n_1} g_{n_2} g_{n_3} g_{n_4}}{\langle n_1\rangle \langle n_2\rangle \langle n_3\rangle^{s+1} \langle n_4\rangle^{s+1}} \Big) \\ &\qquad \times \Big(\sum_{\substack{\Lambda_3 \\ \max |m_j|>M}} \frac{\overline{g_{m_1} g_{m_2} g_{m_3} g_{m_4}}}{\langle m_1\rangle \langle m_2\rangle \langle m_3\rangle^{s+1} \langle m_4\rangle^{s+1}} \Big) \bigg]^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.24}$$

Recalling that

$$\mathbb{E}\big[g_n^k \overline{g_m}^\ell \big] = \delta_{nm} \delta_{k\ell} \cdot k!,$$

we see that the non-zero contribution to (3.24) comes from $m_j = n_{\sigma(j)}$, $j = 1, \dots, 4$, for some permutation $\sigma \in S_4$. Hence, we have

$$(3.24) \lesssim \bigg[\sum_{\substack{\Gamma_N \\ \max |n_j|>M}} \Big(\frac{1}{\langle n_1\rangle^2 \langle n_2\rangle^2 \langle n_3\rangle^{2(s+1)} \langle n_4\rangle^{2(s+1)}} + \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^4 \langle n_j\rangle^{s+2}} \Big) \bigg]^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim M^{-1}.$$

This proves (3.23) and hence (3.16). This completes the proof of Lemma 3.4. □

Finally, we conclude this section by presenting the proof of Proposition 3.1.

Proof of Proposition 3.1. First, note that (3.4) follows from Lemma 3.4. Next, let us show how Lemma 3.4 implies (3.3). It suffices to show

$$\int_1^\infty \mu_{s,N,r}\big((u,v) \,:\, -F_N(u) > \log\lambda\big)\lambda^p d\lambda \leq C \tag{3.25}$$

for some finite $C > 0$ *independent* of the truncation parameter N. Here, $\mu_{s,N,r}$ is the Gaussian measure μ_s with a cutoff on the truncated energy $E_N(u,v)$ defined in (1.23). While $F_N(u) = R_{s,N}(\pi u)$ is not sign-definite, the defocusing nature of the equation plays an important role. In fact, from (3.2) and (3.11) with (1.16), we have the following logarithmic bound:

$$-F_N(u) \leq \frac{3}{2}\sigma_N \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} u^2 \leq C_r \log N, \tag{3.26}$$

in the support of $\mu_{s,N,r}$. In view of this logarithmic upper bound on $-F_N(u)$, we apply Nelson's estimate [12] to prove (3.25). See [6, 14] for analogous arguments in the context of the Φ^{2k}_2-theory.

We need to estimate the measure

$$\mu_{s,N,r}\big((u,v) : -F_N(u) > \log\lambda\big) \tag{3.27}$$

for each given $\lambda \geq 1$. Choose $N_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\log\lambda = 2C_r \log N_0. \tag{3.28}$$

Then, it follows from (3.26) that the contribution to (3.27) is 0 when $N < N_0$. On the other hand, when $N \geq N_0$, from (3.26) and Lemma 3.4 (see Remark 3.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_{s,N,r}\big((u,v) : -F_N(u) > \log\lambda\big) &\leq \mu_{s,N,r}\big((u,v) : -F_N(u) + F_{N_0}(u) > \tfrac{1}{2}\log\lambda\big)\\ &\leq Ce^{-c(\log\lambda)^{\frac{1}{2}}N_0^{\frac{\theta}{2}}} = Ce^{-c'(\log\lambda)^{\frac{1}{2}}\lambda^{\frac{\theta}{2}}}.\end{aligned}$$

This exponential decay ensures the bound (3.25) which in turn implies (3.3).

Finally, the uniform bound (3.3) implies (3.5) by a standard argument (see [22, Remark 3.8]). More precisely, the L^p convergence (3.5) follows from the uniform L^p bound (3.3) and the softer convergence in measure (as a consequence of (3.4)). This completes the proof of Proposition 3.1. □

4. Renormalized energy estimate

In this section, we establish the probabilistic energy estimate on the renormalized energy (Theorem 1.3). As in Subsection 1.4, let $u_N = \pi_N u$ and $v_N = \pi_N v$. Then, from (1.20), we have

$$\partial_t E_{s,N}(\pi_N \Phi_N(t)(u,v))|_{t=0} = Q_1(u,v) + Q_2(u,v) + Q_3(u,v),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} Q_1(u,v) &= 3\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \mathbf{P}_{\neq 0}[(J^s u_N)^2]\, \mathbf{P}_{\neq 0}[v_N u_N], \\ Q_2(u,v) &= 3\bigg(\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (J^s u_N)^2 - \sigma_N\bigg)\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} v_N u_N, \\ Q_3(u,v) &= \sum_{\substack{|\alpha|+|\beta|+|\gamma|\le s\\ |\alpha|,|\beta|,|\gamma|<s}} c_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} J^s v_N\cdot \partial^\alpha u_N\cdot \partial^\beta u_N\cdot \partial^\gamma u_N, \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

In the following, we prove

$$\|Q_j(u,v)\|_{L^p(d\mu_{s,N,r})} \lesssim p \tag{4.2}$$

for $j = 1, 2, 3$.

4.1. **Estimate on $Q_2(u,v)$.** By Cauchy-Schwarz and Cauchy's inequalities, we have

$$\bigg|\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} v_N u_N\bigg| \le \|u_N\|_{L^2}\|v_N\|_{L^2} \le E_N(u,v).$$

Then, proceeding as in (3.19) with Lemma 3.2 and (3.20), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q_2(u,v)\|_{L^p(d\mu_{s,N,r})} &\le C_r\bigg\|\int_{\mathbb{T}^2}(J^s\pi_N u)^2 - \sigma_N\bigg\|_{L^p(d\mu_s)} \\ &\sim \bigg\|\sum_{\substack{n\in\mathbb{Z}^2\\ |n|\le N}}\frac{|g_n(\omega)|^2-1}{\langle n\rangle^2}\bigg\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \le p\bigg\|\sum_{\substack{n\in\mathbb{Z}^2\\ |n|\le N}}\frac{|g_n(\omega)|^2-1}{\langle n\rangle^2}\bigg\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\lesssim p. \end{aligned}$$

This proves (4.2) in this case.

4.2. **Estimate on $Q_1(u,v)$.** By applying the Littlewood-Paley decomposition, we have

$$Q_1(u,v) = \sum_{\substack{N_1,N_2,N_3,N_4\ge 1\\ \text{dyadic}}} Q_1^{\mathbf{N}}(u,v),$$

where $\mathbf{N} := (N_1, N_2, N_3, N_4)$ and

$$Q_1^{\mathbf{N}}(u,v) = 3\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \mathbf{P}_{\neq 0}[J^s\mathbf{P}_{N_1}u_N\cdot J^s\mathbf{P}_{N_2}u_N]\,\mathbf{P}_{\neq 0}[\mathbf{P}_{N_3}v_N\cdot\mathbf{P}_{N_4}u_N]. \tag{4.3}$$

We consider several cases according to the sizes of N_1, N_2, N_3, N_4.

Case (i): $N_4 \gtrsim \max(N_1, N_2)^{\frac{1}{100}}$.

Since $\mathbf{P}_{\neq 0}$ is clearly bounded on $L^p(\mathbb{T}^2)$, $1\le p\le\infty$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |Q_1^{\mathbf{N}}(u,v)| &\lesssim \big\|\mathbf{P}_{\neq 0}[J^s\mathbf{P}_{N_1}u_N\cdot J^s\mathbf{P}_{N_2}u_N\big\|_{L^\infty_x}\big\|\mathbf{P}_{\neq 0}[\mathbf{P}_{N_3}v_N\cdot\mathbf{P}_{N_4}u_N]\big\|_{L^1_x} \\ &\le \|J^s\mathbf{P}_{N_1}u_N\|_{L^\infty_x}\|J^s\mathbf{P}_{N_2}u_N\|_{L^\infty_x}\|\mathbf{P}_{N_3}v_N\|_{L^2_x}\|\mathbf{P}_{N_4}u_N\|_{L^2_x}. \end{aligned}$$

Noting that

$$\|\mathbf{P}_{N_3}v_N\|_{L^2_x}\|\mathbf{P}_{N_4}u_N\|_{L^2_x} \lesssim N_4^{-1}E_N(u,v),$$

we have

$$\|Q_1^{\mathbf{N}}(u,v)\|_{L^p(d\mu_{s,N,r})} \le C_r N_4^{-1}\Big\|\|J^s\mathbf{P}_{N_1}u_N\|_{L^\infty_x}\|J^s\mathbf{P}_{N_2}u_N\|_{L^\infty_x}\Big\|_{L^p(d\mu_s)}.$$

Thanks to Lemma 3.3, we have

$$\big\| \|J^s \mathbf{P}_{N_j} u_N\|_{L^\infty_x} \big\|_{L^{2p}(\mu_s)} \leq C_\delta \sqrt{p} N_j^\delta$$

for any $\delta > 0$, $j = 1, 2$. Hence, for any $\delta > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q_1^{\mathbf{N}}(u, v)\|_{L^p(d\mu_{s,N,r})} &\leq C_r N_4^{-1} \Big\| \|J^s \mathbf{P}_{N_1} u_N\|_{L^\infty_x} \|J^s \mathbf{P}_{N_2} u_N\|_{L^\infty_x} \Big\|_{L^p(d\mu_s)} \\ &\lesssim p N_4^{-1} N_1^\delta N_2^\delta. \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

By noting that $Q_1^{\mathbf{N}}(u, v)$ is not trivial only if

$$N_3 \lesssim N_1 + N_2 + N_4,$$

we can readily sum (4.4) over the dyadic blocks N_j, $j = 1, \dots, 4$. This yields (4.2) in this case.

Case (ii): $N_4 \ll \max(N_1, N_2)^{\frac{1}{100}}$.

In this case, we have $\max(N_1, N_2) \sim \max\{N_j, j = 1, \dots, 4\}$. Without loss of generality, assume $N_2 \leq N_1 \sim \max\{N_j, j = 1, \dots, 4\}$. Let $a = a(s) > 0$ be sufficiently small (to be chosen later). We consider the following two cases:

$$\text{(ii.a):} \quad N_3 \ll N_1^{1-a} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \text{(ii.b):} \ N_3 \gtrsim N_1^{1-a}.$$

• **Subcase (ii.a):** $N_3 \ll N_1^{1-a}$.

In this case, we have $N_1 \sim N_2$. By Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\|\widehat{u}_n\|_{\ell^{1+}_n} \lesssim E_N(u, v)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{4.5}$$

Then, given $p \geq 2$, it follows from Young's inequality, (4.5), and Minkowski's inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} &\big\|Q_1^{\mathbf{N}}(u, v)\big\|_{L^p(d\mu_{s,N,r})} \\ &\quad \lesssim \Bigg\| \Bigg\| \sum_{\substack{n = n_1 + n_2 \\ |n_j| \sim N_j, |n_j| \leq N, j = 1,2 \\ 1 \leq |n_1 + n_2| \ll N_1^{1-a}}} \langle n_1 \rangle^s \widehat{u}_{n_1} \langle n_2 \rangle^s \widehat{u}_{n_2} \Bigg\|_{\ell^{2-}_n} \underbrace{\|\widehat{v}_{n_3}\|_{\ell^2_{n_3}} \|\widehat{u}_{n_4}\|_{\ell^{1+}_{n_4}}}_{\lesssim E_N(u,v)} \Bigg\|_{L^p(d\mu_{s,N,r})} \\ &\quad \leq C_{r,\varepsilon} \Bigg\| \Bigg\| \sum_{\substack{n = n_1 + n_2 \\ |n_j| \sim N_j, |n_j| \leq N, j = 1,2 \\ 1 \leq |n_1 + n_2| \ll N_1^{1-a}}} \langle n_1 \rangle^s \widehat{u}_{n_1} \langle n_2 \rangle^s \widehat{u}_{n_2} \Bigg\|_{\ell^{2-\varepsilon}_n} \Bigg\|_{L^p(d\mu_s)} \\ &\quad \leq C_{r,\varepsilon} \Bigg\| \Bigg\| \sum_{\substack{n = n_1 + n_2 \\ |n_j| \sim N_j, |n_j| \leq N, j = 1,2 \\ 1 \leq |n_1 + n_2| \ll N_1^{1-a}}} \langle n_1 \rangle^s \widehat{u}_{n_1} \langle n_2 \rangle^s \widehat{u}_{n_2} \Bigg\|_{L^p(d\mu_s)} \Bigg\|_{\ell^{2-\varepsilon}(|n| \lesssim N_1^{1-a})} \end{aligned}$$

for any small $\varepsilon > 0$. Here, we have $n_1 + n_2 \neq 0$ thanks to the first projection $\mathbf{P}_{\neq 0}$ in the definition (4.1) of $Q_1(u, v)$, while we have $|n_1 + n_2| = |n_3 + n_4| \lesssim \max(N_3, N_4) \ll N_1^{1-a}$.

By the Wiener chaos estimate (Lemma 3.2) with (1.5) and $N_1 \sim N_2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\big\|Q_1^{\mathbf{N}}(u,v)\big\|_{L^p(d\mu_{s,N,r})} &\le C_{r,\varepsilon}\, p \bigg\| \bigg\| \sum_{\substack{n=n_1+n_2\\ |n_j|\sim N_j, |n_j|\le N, j=1,2\\ 1\le |n_1+n_2|\ll N_1^{1-a}}} \frac{g_{n_1}(\omega)}{\langle n_1\rangle}\frac{g_{n_2}(\omega)}{\langle n_2\rangle}\bigg\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\bigg\|_{\ell^{2-\varepsilon}_n(|n|\lesssim N_1^{1-a})}\\
&\lesssim C_{r,\varepsilon}\, p \bigg\| \Big(\sum_{|n_1|\sim N_1} N_1^{-4}\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}\bigg\|_{\ell^{2-\varepsilon}_n(|n|\lesssim N_1^{1-a})}\\
&\sim pN_1^{-1}\big\|\mathbf{1}_{|n|\lesssim N_1^{1-a}}\big\|_{\ell^{2-\varepsilon}_n} \sim pN_1^{-1}N_1^{\frac{2-2a}{2-\varepsilon}} = pN_1^{\frac{-2a+\varepsilon}{2-\varepsilon}}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by choosing sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\varepsilon < 2a$, we have a negative power of N_1 that can be used to sum over the dyadic blocks. This proves (4.2) in this case.

• **Subcase (ii.b):** $N_3 \gtrsim N_1^{1-a}$.

By Young's inequality, (4.5), and Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\big\|Q_1^{\mathbf{N}}(u,v)\big\|_{L^p(d\mu_{s,N,r})} &\lesssim \bigg\| \bigg\| \sum_{\substack{n=n_1+n_2+n_3\\ |n_j|\sim N_j, |n_j|\le N, j=1,2,3\\ n_1+n_2\neq 0\\ |n_1+n_2+n_3|\ll N_1^{\frac{1}{100}}}} \langle n_1\rangle^s \widehat{u}_{n_1}\langle n_2\rangle^s \widehat{u}_{n_2}\widehat{v}_{n_3}\bigg\|_{\ell^q_n} \underbrace{\|\widehat{u}_{n_4}\|_{\ell^{1+}_{n_4}}}_{\lesssim E_N(u,v)^{\frac{1}{2}}}\bigg\|_{L^p(d\mu_{s,N,r})}\\
&\lesssim C_r \bigg\| \mathbf{1}_{\{E_N(u,v)\le r\}}\bigg\| \sum_{\substack{n=n_1+n_2+n_3\\ |n_j|\sim N_j, |n_j|\le N, j=1,2,3\\ n_1+n_2\neq 0\\ |n_1+n_2+n_3|\ll N_1^{\frac{1}{100}}}} \langle n_1\rangle^s \widehat{u}_{n_1}\langle n_2\rangle^s \widehat{u}_{n_2}\widehat{v}_{n_3}\bigg\|_{\ell^q_n}\bigg\|_{L^p(d\mu_s)}\end{aligned}$$

for some $q \gg 1$ (to be chosen later). Now, we can trivially write

$$\begin{aligned}\big\|Q_1^{\mathbf{N}}(u,v)\big\|_{L^p(d\mu_{s,N,r})} \lesssim \bigg\| \mathbf{1}_{\{E_N(u,v)\le r\}} \bigg(\sum_{|n|\ll N_1^{\frac{1}{100}}} \bigg| \sum_{\substack{n=n_1+n_2+n_3\\ n_1+n_2\neq 0\\ |n_j|\sim N_j, |n_j|\le N, j=1,2,3}} \langle n_1\rangle^s \widehat{u}_{n_1}\langle n_2\rangle^s \widehat{u}_{n_2}\widehat{v}_{n_3}\bigg|^{\frac{q}{3}}\\
\times \bigg| \sum_{\substack{n=n_1+n_2+n_3\\ n_1+n_2\neq 0\\ |n_j|\sim N_j, |n_j|\le N, j=1,2,3}} \langle n_1\rangle^s \widehat{u}_{n_1}\langle n_2\rangle^s \widehat{u}_{n_2}\widehat{v}_{n_3}\bigg|^{\frac{2q}{3}}\bigg)^{\frac{1}{q}}\bigg\|_{L^p(d\mu_s)}.\end{aligned}$$

In the following, we estimate the first and second factors on the right-hand side above in a different manner. For the first factor, we shall use the energy restriction $E_N(u,v) \le r$, while, for the second factor, we shall invoke Wiener chaos estimate (Lemma 3.2). The balance between the powers is chosen so that we obtain p to power one at the end. The main point in this procedure is that we get tractable bounds with respect to the dyadic

frequency localization. Consequently, in the case under consideration, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\big\|Q_1^{\mathbf{N}}(u,v)\big\|_{L^p(d\mu_{s,N,r})}\\
&\quad\lesssim \Big\| \mathbf{1}_{\{E_N(u,v)\le r\}} \Big(\sum_{|n|\ll N_1^{\frac{1}{100}}} \Big(N_1^{2s-2} \|\langle n_1\rangle \widehat{u}_{n_1}\|_{\ell^2_{n_1}} \|\langle n_2\rangle \widehat{u}_{n_2}\|_{\ell^2_{n_2}} \underbrace{\|\widehat{v}_{n_3}\|_{\ell^1_{n_3}}}_{\lesssim N_1\|v\|_{L^2}} \Big)^{\frac{q}{3}}\\
&\qquad\qquad \times \Big| \sum_{\substack{n=n_1+n_2+n_3\\ n_1+n_2\neq 0\\ |n_j|\sim N_j, |n_j|\le N, j=1,2,3}} \langle n_1\rangle^s \widehat{u}_{n_1} \langle n_2\rangle^s \widehat{u}_{n_2} \widehat{v}_{n_3} \Big|^{\frac{2q}{3}} \Big)^{\frac{1}{q}} \Big\|_{L^p(d\mu_s)} \qquad (4.6)\\
&\quad\le C_r N_1^{\frac{2s-1}{3}} \Big\| \Big(\sum_{|n|\ll N_1^{\frac{1}{100}}} \Big| \sum_{\substack{n=n_1+n_2+n_3\\ n_1+n_2\neq 0\\ |n_j|\sim N_j, |n_j|\le N, j=1,2,3}} \langle n_1\rangle^s \widehat{u}_{n_1} \langle n_2\rangle^s \widehat{u}_{n_2} \widehat{v}_{n_3} \Big|^{\frac{2q}{3}} \Big)^{\frac{3}{2q}} \Big\|^{\frac{2}{3}}_{L^{\frac{2p}{3}}(d\mu_s)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Without loss of generality, assume $p \ge q$. Then, by Minkowski's inequality and the Wiener chaos estimate (Lemma 3.2) with (1.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big\| \Big(\sum_{|n|\ll N_1^{\frac{1}{100}}} \Big| \sum_{\substack{n=n_1+n_2+n_3\\ n_1+n_2\neq 0\\ |n_j|\sim N_j, |n_j|\le N, j=1,2,3}} \langle n_1\rangle^s \widehat{u}_{n_1} \langle n_2\rangle^s \widehat{u}_{n_2} \widehat{v}_{n_3} \Big|^{\frac{2q}{3}} \Big)^{\frac{3}{2q}} \Big\|_{L^{\frac{2p}{3}}(d\mu_s)}\\
&\quad\le \Big\| \Big\| \sum_{\substack{n=n_1+n_2+n_3\\ n_1+n_2\neq 0\\ |n_j|\sim N_j, |n_j|\le N, j=1,2,3}} \langle n_1\rangle^s \widehat{u}_{n_1} \langle n_2\rangle^s \widehat{u}_{n_2} \widehat{v}_{n_3} \Big\|_{L^{\frac{2p}{3}}(d\mu_s)} \Big\|_{\ell^{\frac{2q}{3}}(|n|\ll N_1^{\frac{1}{100}})}\\
&\quad\le p^{\frac{3}{2}} \Big\| \Big\| \sum_{\substack{n=n_1+n_2+n_3\\ n_1+n_2\neq 0\\ |n_j|\sim N_j, |n_j|\le N, j=1,2,3}} \langle n_1\rangle^s \widehat{u}_{n_1} \langle n_2\rangle^s \widehat{u}_{n_2} \widehat{v}_{n_3} \Big\|_{L^2(d\mu_s)} \Big\|_{\ell^{\frac{2q}{3}}(|n|\ll N_1^{\frac{1}{100}})}\\
&\quad= p^{\frac{3}{2}} \Big\| \Big\| \sum_{\substack{n=n_1+n_2+n_3\\ n_1+n_2\neq 0\\ |n_j|\sim N_j, |n_j|\le N, j=1,2,3}} \frac{g_{n_1}}{\langle n_1\rangle} \frac{g_{n_2}}{\langle n_2\rangle} \frac{h_{n_3}}{\langle n_3\rangle^s} \Big\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \Big\|_{\ell^{\frac{2q}{3}}(|n|\ll N_1^{\frac{1}{100}})}\\
&\quad\lesssim p^{\frac{3}{2}} \Big\| \Big(\sum_{|n_j|\sim N_j,\, j=2,3} N_1^{-2} \frac{1}{\langle n_2\rangle^2} \frac{1}{\langle n_3\rangle^{2s}} \Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Big\|_{\ell^{\frac{2q}{3}}_n(|n|\ll N_1^{\frac{1}{100}})}. \qquad (4.7)
\end{aligned}$$

Summing over n_2 and n_3 with $N_2 \le N_1$ and $N_1^{1-a} \lesssim N_3 \lesssim N_1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{LHS of (4.7)} &\lesssim p^{\frac{3}{2}} \Big\| \Big(N_1^{-2} N_1^{(-2s+2)(1-a)} \Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Big\|_{\ell^{\frac{2q}{3}}_n(|n|\ll N_1^{\frac{1}{100}})}\\
&= p^{\frac{3}{2}} N_1^{-s+as-a} \big\| \mathbf{1}_{|n|\ll N_1^{\frac{1}{100}}} \big\|_{\ell^{\frac{2q}{3}}_n} \lesssim p^{\frac{3}{2}} N_1^{-s+as-a} N_1^{\frac{3}{100q}}. \qquad (4.8)
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by choosing sufficiently large $q \gg 1$ and sufficiently small $a = a(s) > 0$, it follows from (4.6) and (4.8) that

$$\big\|Q_1^{\mathbf{N}}(u,v)\big\|_{L^p(d\mu_{s,N,r})} \lesssim CpN_1^{-\frac{1}{3}+\frac{2}{3}as-\frac{2}{3}a+\frac{1}{50q}} \lesssim CpN_1^{-\alpha}$$

for some $\alpha > 0$. Once again, we obtained a negative power of N_1, allowing us to sum over the dyadic blocks. This proves (4.2) in Subcase (ii.b).

4.3. **Estimate on $Q_3(u,v)$.** It remains to prove (4.2) for $j = 3$. It turns out that $Q_3(u,v)$ can be estimated essentially in the same manner as $Q_1(u,v)$. By integration by parts, we can express each summand in the definition of $Q_3(u,v)$ as

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \partial^\kappa v_N \cdot \partial^\alpha u_N \cdot \partial^\beta u_N \cdot \partial^\gamma u_N, \tag{4.9}$$

where $|\kappa| \le s-1$, $|\alpha|+|\beta|+|\gamma| \le s+1$, and $\max(|\alpha|,|\beta|,|\gamma|) \le s$.

Let us first consider the case $\max(|\alpha|,|\beta|,|\gamma|) = s$. By symmetry, we assume that $|\alpha| \ge |\beta| \ge |\gamma|$ and therefore $|\alpha| = s$. We then necessarily have $|\beta| = 1$ and $|\gamma| = 0$. Then, we can treat (4.9) exactly in the same manner as we did for $Q_1(u,v)$ by replacing $\mathbf{P}_{\neq 0}[(J^s u_N)^2]$ and $\mathbf{P}_{\neq 0}[v_N u_N]$ in the definition (4.1) of $Q_1(u,v)$ with $\partial^\kappa v_N \cdot \partial^\alpha u_N$ and $\partial^\beta u_N \cdot \partial^\gamma u_N$, respectively. Note that, while the frequency projection $\mathbf{P}_{\neq 0}[(J^s u_N)^2]$ in the definition of $Q_1(u,v)$ played an important role in eliminating the logarithmic divergence, we do not need a frequency projection $\mathbf{P}_{\neq 0}$ on $\partial^\kappa v_N \cdot \partial^\alpha u_N$ since, in view of (1.5), the independence of v_N and u_N prevents such logarithmic divergence.

Therefore, we can suppose that $\max(|\alpha|,|\beta|,|\gamma|) \le s-1$. We only consider the worst case $|\alpha|+|\beta|+|\gamma| = s+1$ and $|\kappa| = s-1$ in the following. In this case, noting that $\partial^\kappa v_N$ with $|\kappa| = s-1$ behaves like $J^s \pi_N u$ (see (1.5)), we can basically proceed as we did for $Q_1(u,v)$ in the previous subsection. Indeed, by applying the Littlewood-Paley decomposition, we need to study the expression of the form

$$\widetilde{Q}_1^{\mathbf{N}}(u,v) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \partial^\kappa \mathbf{P}_{N_1} v_N \cdot \partial^\alpha \mathbf{P}_{N_2} u_N \cdot \partial^\beta \mathbf{P}_{N_3} u_N \cdot \partial^\gamma \mathbf{P}_{N_4} u_N.$$

By symmetry, assume $N_2 \ge N_3 \ge N_4$. Then, we have

$$\widetilde{Q}_1^{\mathbf{N}}(u,v) \sim \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \partial^\kappa \mathbf{P}_{N_1} v_N \cdot N_2^{s-|\alpha|} \partial^\alpha \mathbf{P}_{N_2} u_N \cdot N_2^{1-|\beta|} \partial^\beta \mathbf{P}_{N_3} u_N \cdot N_2^{-|\gamma|} \partial^\gamma \mathbf{P}_{N_4} u_N. \tag{4.10}$$

As mentioned above, the first factor $\partial^\kappa \mathbf{P}_{N_1} v_N$ in (4.10) behaves like $J^s \mathbf{P}_{N_1} u_N$ in (4.3). The second factor $N_2^{s-|\alpha|}\partial^\alpha \mathbf{P}_{N_2} u_N \sim \partial^{\widetilde{\alpha}} \mathbf{P}_{N_2} u_N$ with $|\widetilde{\alpha}| = s$ also behaves like the second factor $J^s \mathbf{P}_{N_2} u_N$ in (4.3). Similarly, the third and fourth factors in (4.10):

$$N_2^{1-|\beta|}\partial^\beta \mathbf{P}_{N_3} u_N \text{ “}\lesssim\text{” } \nabla \mathbf{P}_{N_3} u_N \qquad \text{and} \qquad N_2^{-|\gamma|}\partial^\gamma \mathbf{P}_{N_4} u_N \text{ “}\lesssim\text{” } \mathbf{P}_{N_4} u_N$$

behave (at worst) like the third and fourth factors in (4.3), respectively. Hence, we can estimate $\widetilde{Q}_1^{\mathbf{N}}(u,v)$ just as we did for $Q_1^{\mathbf{N}}(u,v)$ in the previous section. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.3.

5. Proof of Theorem 1.2

In this section, we prove quasi-invariance of the Gaussian measure μ_s under the NLKG dynamics (Theorem 1.2). While the general structure of the argument is similar to our previous works [23, 16] (see also [17] for a concise sketch of the general structure), we proceed differently in some part (see Proposition 5.3).

5.1. **A change-of-variable formula.** As in our previous works [23, 16] , the change-of-variable formula (Lemma 5.1) for the nonlinear transformation induced by the truncated flow $\Phi_N(t)$ plays an important role. We also point out that these change-of-variable formulas in this paper and in [23, 16] are in turn inspired by [25].

Given $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote by $\mathcal{E}_N$ the real vector space:

$$\mathcal{E}_N = \text{span}\big\{ \cos(n\cdot x), \sin(n\cdot x)\big\}_{|n|\leq N}.$$

We equip $\mathcal{E}_N$ with the natural scalar product. Moreover, we endow $\mathcal{E}_N \times \mathcal{E}_N$ with a Lebesgue measure L_N as follows. Given

$$(\pi_N u)(x) = \sum_{|n|\leq N} \widehat{u}_n\, e^{in\cdot x}, \qquad \widehat{u}_{-n} = \overline{\widehat{u}_n},$$

let $a_n = \text{Re}\,\widehat{u}_n$ and $b_n = \text{Im}\,\widehat{u}_n$, $(a_n, b_n) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Then, we have

$$(\pi_N u)(x) = a_0 + \sum_{0<|n|\leq N} \big\{a_n(2\cos(n\cdot x)) + b_n(-2\sin(n\cdot x))\big\}.$$

Therefore, it is natural to define L_N as the Lebesgue measure on $\mathcal{E}_N \times \mathcal{E}_N$ with respect to the orthogonal basis:

$$\Big\{1, \big\{2\cos(n\cdot x), -2\sin(n\cdot x)\big\}_{0<|n|\leq N}\Big\} \times \Big\{1, \big\{2\cos(n\cdot x), -2\sin(n\cdot x)\big\}_{0<|n|\leq N}\Big\}.$$

Next, we denote by $(\mathcal{E}_N \times \mathcal{E}_N)^\perp$ the orthogonal complement of $\mathcal{E}_N \times \mathcal{E}_N$ in $\mathcal{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^2)$, $\sigma < s$. We endow $(\mathcal{E}_N \times \mathcal{E}_N)^\perp$ with the marginal Gaussian measure $\mu_{s;N}^\perp$ on $\pi_N^\perp \mathcal{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^2)$ which is the induced probability measure under the map:

$$\omega \in \Omega \longmapsto (\pi_N^\perp u^\omega, \pi_N^\perp v^\omega),$$

where (u^ω, v^ω) is as in (1.5). By viewing the Gaussian measure μ_s as a product measure on $(\mathcal{E}_N \times \mathcal{E}_N) \times (\mathcal{E}_N \times \mathcal{E}_N)^\perp$, we can write the truncated weighted Gaussian measure $\rho_{s,N,r}$ defined in (3.1) as

$$\begin{aligned} d\rho_{s,N,r}(u,v) &= Z_{s,N,r}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{E_N(u,v)\leq r\}}\, e^{-R_{s,N}(\pi_N u)} d\mu_s(u,v), \\ &= \hat{Z}_{s,N,r}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{E_N(u,v)\leq r\}}\, e^{-E_{s,N}(\pi_N u, \pi_N v)}\, dL_N \otimes \mu_{s;N}^\perp, \end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{Z}_{s,N,r}$ is defined by

$$\hat{Z}_{s,N,r} = \int_{\mathcal{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^2)} \mathbf{1}_{\{E_N(u,v)\leq r\}}\, e^{-E_{s,N}(\pi_N u, \pi_N v)}\, dL_N \otimes \mu_{s;N}^\perp.$$

Then, we have the following change-of-variable formula.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $s > 1$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, and $r > 0$. Then, we have*

$$\rho_{s,N,r}(\Phi_N(t)(A)) = \hat{Z}_{s,N,r}^{-1} \int_A \mathbf{1}_{\{E_N(u,v)\leq r\}}\, e^{-E_{s,N}(\pi_N \Phi_N(t)(u,v))}\, dL_N \otimes \mu_{s;N}^\perp$$

for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and any measurable set $A \subset \mathcal{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^2)$, $\sigma \in (1, s)$.

Lemma 5.1 follows from similar considerations presented in [23, 16] and therefore we omit its proof.

5.2. **The evolution of the truncated measures.** We now study the evolution of the truncated measures $\rho_{s,N,r}$. We shall use the renormalized energy estimate (Theorem 1.3) as a key step in the proof of the following statement. Due to the use of Theorem 1.3, we assume that $s \geq 2$ is an even integer in the following. While all the implicit constants depend on s, we may not state their dependence in an explicit manner.

Lemma 5.2. *Given $r > 0$, there exists $C_r > 0$ such that*

$$\frac{d}{dt}\rho_{s,N,r}(\Phi_N(t)(A)) \leq C_r p \left\{\rho_{s,N,r}(\Phi_N(t)(A))\right\}^{1-\frac{1}{p}}$$

for any $p \geq 2$, any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, and any measurable set $A \subset \mathcal{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^2)$, $\sigma \in (1, s)$.

While the proof of Lemma 5.2 also follows from the argument in our previous works [23, 16], we present its details in order to show the use of the crucial renormalized energy estimate.

Proof. Fix $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. As in [25, 23, 16], the main idea is to reduce the analysis to that at $t = 0$. Using the flow property of $\Phi_N(t)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}\rho_{s,N,r}(\Phi_N(t)(A))\Big|_{t=t_0} &= Z_{s,N,r}^{-1}\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\Phi_N(t)(A)} \mathbf{1}_{\{E_N(u,v)\leq r\}}\, e^{-R_{s,N}(\pi_N u)} d\mu_s(u,v)\Big|_{t=t_0} \\
&= Z_{s,N,r}^{-1}\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\Phi_N(t)(\Phi_N(t_0)(A))} \mathbf{1}_{\{E_N(u,v)\leq r\}}\, e^{-R_{s,N}(\pi_N u)} d\mu_s(u,v)\Big|_{t=0}.
\end{aligned}$$

By the change-of-variable formula (Lemma 5.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{dt}\rho_{s,N,r}(\Phi_N(t)(A))\Big|_{t=t_0} \\
&\quad = \hat{Z}_{s,N,r}^{-1}\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\Phi_N(t_0)(A)} \mathbf{1}_{\{E_N(u,v)\leq r\}}\, e^{-E_{s,N}(\pi_N\Phi_N(t)(u,v))} dL_N \otimes \mu_{s;N}^{\perp}\Big|_{t=0} \\
&\quad = Z_{s,N,r}^{-1}\int_{\Phi_N(t_0)(A)} \mathbf{1}_{\{E_N(u,v)\leq r\}}\, \partial_t E_{s,N}(\pi_N\Phi_N(t)(u,v))|_{t=0}\, e^{-R_{s,N}(\pi_N u)} d\mu_s(u,v).
\end{aligned}$$

Now, Hölder's inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}\rho_{s,N,r}(\Phi_N(t)(A))\Big|_{t=t_0} \leq \big\|\partial_t E_{s,N}(\pi_N\Phi_N(t)(u,v))|_{t=0}\big\|_{L^p(\rho_{s,N,r})} \\
\times \left\{\rho_{s,N,r}(\Phi_N(t_0)(A))\right\}^{1-\frac{1}{p}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that Proposition 3.1 implies that $Z_{s,N,r}^{-1}$ is bounded, uniformly in N. Finally, by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality together with the uniform estimate (3.3) in Proposition 3.1 and

Theorem 1.3, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\big\|\partial_t E_{s,N}(\pi_N \Phi_N(t)(u,v))|_{t=0}\big\|_{L^p(\rho_{s,N,r})} \\
&\qquad \le Z_{s,N,r}^{-\frac{1}{p}} \Big\|\partial_t E_{s,N}(\pi_N \Phi_N(t)(u,v))|_{t=0}\Big\|_{L^{2p}(\mu_{s,N,r})} \Big\|\mathbf{1}_{\{E_N(u,v)\le r\}}\, e^{-R_{s,N}(\pi_N u)}\Big\|_{L^{2p}(\mu_s)} \\
&\qquad \le C_r p,
\end{aligned}$$

since $Z_{s,N,r}^{-\frac{1}{p}} \le C(s,r)$ for any $p \ge 2$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$. This completes the proof of Lemma 5.2. □

As a corollary to Lemma 5.2, we obtain the following control on the truncated measures $\rho_{s,N,r}$. We point out that this is where our argument diverges from the presentation in our previous works [23, 16].

Proposition 5.3. *Given $r > 0$, there exists $t_r > 0$ such that given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that if, for a measurable set $A \subset \mathcal{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^2)$, $\sigma \in (1, s)$, there exists $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that*

$$\rho_{s,N,r}(A) < \delta$$

for any $N \ge N_0$, then we have

$$\rho_{s,N,r}(\Phi_N(t)(A)) < \varepsilon$$

for any $t \in [0, t_r]$ and any $N \ge N_0$.

Remark 5.4. In Proposition 5.3, we can choose $t_r > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ such that they are independent of $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, $\delta > 0$ is independent of $t_r > 0$.

Proof. From Lemma 5.2, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}\big\{\rho_{s,N,r}(\Phi_N(t)(A))\big\}^{\frac{1}{p}} \le C_r \tag{5.1}$$

for any $p \ge 2$. Integrating (5.1) from 0 to t, we obtain

$$\rho_{s,N,r}(\Phi_N(t)(A)) \le \big\{\big(\rho_{s,N,r}(A)\big)^{\frac{1}{p}} + C_r t\big\}^p. \tag{5.2}$$

Now, choose $t_r > 0$ such that $C_r t_r = \frac{1}{4}$. Without loss of generality, assume $\varepsilon < 1$. It follows from (5.2) and the convexity inequality:

$$\Big(\frac{x+y}{2}\Big)^p \le \frac{x^p + y^p}{2}, \qquad x, y \ge 0,\ p \ge 1$$

that for $t \in [0, t_r]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_{s,N,r}(\Phi_N(t)(A)) &\le 2^{p-1}\rho_{s,N,r}(A) + 2^{p-1}(C_r t_r)^p \\
&\le 2^{p-1}\rho_{s,N,r}(A) + 2^{-p-1}
\end{aligned}$$

by setting $p = p(\varepsilon) = -\log_2 \varepsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\le 2^{p(\varepsilon)-1}\delta + \tfrac{1}{2}\varepsilon \\
&< \varepsilon,
\end{aligned}$$

by choosing $\delta = \delta(\varepsilon) > 0$ sufficiently small. This completes the proof of Proposition 5.3. □

5.3. **Proof of Theorem 1.2.** We conclude this section by presenting the proof of Theorem 1.2. Proposition 5.3 implies that the truncated weighted Gaussian measures $\rho_{s,N,r}$ are quasi-invariant under the truncated NLKG dynamics $\Phi_N(t)$ with the uniform control in $N \in \mathbb{N}$. We first upgrade Proposition 5.3 to the untruncated weighted Gaussian measure $\rho_{s,r}$ defined in (3.6). Then, we exploit the mutual absolute continuity between $\rho_{s,r}$ and $\mu_{s,r}$, implying quasi-invariance of $\mu_{s,r}$ under the full NLKG dynamics $\Phi(t) = \Phi_{\mathrm{NLKG}}(t)$. Finally, we conclude quasi-invariance of μ_s by taking $r \to \infty$.

Lemma 5.5. *Given $r > 0$, there exists $t_r > 0$ such that given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that if*

$$\rho_{s,r}(A) < \delta$$

for a measurable set $A \subset \mathcal{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^2)$, $\sigma \in (1, s)$, then we have

$$\rho_{s,r}(\Phi(t)(A)) < \varepsilon$$

for any $t \in [0, t_r]$. Note that $\delta > 0$ is independent of $t \in [0, t_r]$.

Proof. Let t_r be as in Proposition 5.3. We first consider the case when A is compact in $\mathcal{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^2)$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Thanks to Proposition 5.3, there is $\delta_1 > 0$ such that if there exists $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\rho_{s,N,r}(A + B_{\theta,\sigma}) < \delta_1$$

for any $N \geq N_0$, then we have

$$\rho_{s,N,r}(\Phi_N(t)(A + B_{\theta,\sigma})) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \tag{5.3}$$

for any $t \in [0, t_r]$ and any $N \geq N_0$. Recall that $B_{\theta,\sigma}$ denotes the (closed) ball of radius $\theta > 0$ in $\mathcal{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^2)$.

We now observe that there exist $\delta_2 > 0$, $N_1 \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\theta > 0$ such that if

$$\rho_{s,N,r}(A) < \delta_2 \tag{5.4}$$

for any $N \geq N_0$, then we have

$$\rho_{s,N,r}(A + B_{\theta,\sigma}) < \delta_1 \tag{5.5}$$

for any $N \geq N_0$. More precisely, by writing

$$d\rho_{s,N,r}(u, v) = G_N(u, v) d\mu_s(u, v) \qquad \text{and} \qquad d\rho_{s,r}(u, v) = G(u, v) d\mu_s(u, v),$$

it follows from Proposition 3.1 that G_N converges to G in $L^p(d\mu_s)$ for every $p < \infty$. We can therefore write

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_{s,N,r}(A + B_{\theta,\sigma}) - \rho_{s,N,r}(A) &= \int_{A+B_{\theta,\sigma}} G_N d\mu_s - \int_A G_N d\mu_s \\
&= \int_{A+B_{\theta,\sigma}} (G_N - G) d\mu_s + \int (\mathbf{1}_{A+B_{\theta,\sigma}} - \mathbf{1}_A) G d\mu_s + \int_A (G - G_N) d\mu_s.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, for the first and third terms, we use the convergence of G_N to G in $L^1(d\mu_s)$, while, for the second term, we invoke the dominated convergence (here we used the fact that A is closed). Therefore, we conclude that (5.4) implies (5.5). We also observe that thanks to (3.7), there exist $\delta > 0$ and $N_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if

$$\rho_{s,r}(A) < \delta, \tag{5.6}$$

then we have (5.4) for any $N \geq N_2$. At this point, we have already fixed the values of δ, θ, N_0, N_1, and N_2. Finally, it follows Lemma 2.3 and (3.7) that there exists $N_3 = N_3(t, \theta, \varepsilon) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if (5.6) holds, then we have

$$\rho_{s,r}(\Phi(t)(A)) \leq \rho_{s,r}(\Phi_N(t)(A + B_{\theta,\sigma})) \leq \rho_{s,N,r}(\Phi_N(t)(A + B_{\theta,\sigma})) + \tfrac{1}{2}\varepsilon < \varepsilon$$

for $N \geq \max(N_0, N_1, N_2, N_3)$. Here, we used (3.7) and (5.3) in the second and third inequalities, respectively. This completes the proof when A is compact.

We now prove the statement for arbitrary measurable sets. Once again, fix $\varepsilon > 0$. We have just proved that there is $\delta > 0$ such that, for every compact set K with $\rho_{s,r}(K) < \delta$, we have

$$\rho_{s,r}(\Phi(t)(K)) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \tag{5.7}$$

for any $t \in [0, t_r]$. Now, let A be an arbitrary measurable set of $\mathcal{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^2)$, $\sigma \in (1, s)$, such that $\rho_{s,r}(A) < \delta$. By the inner regularity of $\rho_{s,r}$, there exists a sequence $\{K_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ of compact sets such that $K_j \subset \Phi(t)(A)$ and

$$\rho_{s,r}(\Phi(t)(A)) = \lim_{j\to\infty} \rho_{s,r}(K_j). \tag{5.8}$$

Note that $\Phi(-t)(K_j)$ is compact since it is the image of the compact set K_j under the continuous map $\Phi(-t)$. Moreover, by the bijectivity of the flow $\Phi(-t)$, we have $\Phi(-t)(K_j) \subset \Phi(-t)\Phi(t)(A) = A$. In particular, we have $\rho_{s,r}(\Phi(-t)(K_j)) < \delta$. Then, applying (5.7) for the compact set $\Phi(-t)K_j$, we obtain

$$\rho_{s,r}(K_j) = \rho_{s,r}\big(\Phi(t)(\Phi(-t)K_j)\big) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \tag{5.9}$$

for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $t \in [0, t_r]$. Hence, the desired conclusion follows from (5.8) and (5.9). This completes the proof of Lemma 5.5. □

Finally, we present the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let $A \subset \mathcal{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^2)$, $\sigma \in (1, s)$, be a measurable set such that $\mu_s(A) = 0$. Then, for any $r > 0$, we have

$$\mu_{s,r}(A) = 0.$$

By the mutual absolute continuity of $\mu_{s,r}$ and $\rho_{s,r}$, we obtain

$$\rho_{s,r}(A) = 0.$$

Then, by Lemma 5.5, we have

$$\rho_{s,r}(\Phi(t)(A)) = 0 \tag{5.10}$$

for $t \in [0, t_r]$. By iterating this argument, we conclude that (5.10) holds for any $t > 0$. By invoking the mutual absolute continuity of $\mu_{s,r}$ and $\rho_{s,r}$ once again, we have

$$\mu_{s,r}(\Phi(t)(A)) = 0.$$

Finally, the dominated convergence theorem yields

$$\mu_s\big(\Phi(t)(A)\big) = \lim_{r\to\infty} \mu_{s,r}\big(\Phi(t)(A)\big) = 0.$$

By the time reversibility of the equation (1.7), the same conclusion holds for any $t < 0$. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.2. □

Remark 5.6. By combining Lemma 5.2 with the Yudovich's argument [26] as in [23, 16] (but with the critical power p^1), we can obtain the following quantitative bound, characterizing the quasi-invariance of $\rho_{s,r}$:

$$\rho_{s,r}(\Phi(t)(A)) \lesssim \big(\rho_{s,r}(A)\big)^{\frac{1}{c^{1+|t|}}}$$

for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Here, the constant $c = c(r)$ depends on $r > 0$.

6. Quasi-invariance under the NLW dynamics

As already mentioned, the proof of Theorem 1.1 for the nonlinear wave equation is very close to that of Theorem 1.2 that we just presented in the previous section. In this section, we only explain the needed modifications.

6.1. **The modified Gaussian measures.** Since the quadratic part of the Hamiltonian H defined in (1.3) for the nonlinear wave equation does not control the L^2-norm, we shall prove the quasi-invariance for a small modification of μ_s that is absolutely continuous with respect to μ_s.

Define $\widetilde{\mu}_s$ as the induced probability measure under the map:

$$\omega \in \Omega \longmapsto (u^\omega(x), v^\omega(x))$$

with

$$u^\omega(x) = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^2} \frac{g_n(\omega)}{(1+|n|^2+|n|^{2s+2})^{\frac{1}{2}}} e^{in\cdot x} \qquad \text{and} \qquad v^\omega(x) = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^2} \frac{h_n(\omega)}{(1+|n|^{2s})^{\frac{1}{2}}} e^{in\cdot x},$$

where $\{g_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^2}$ and $\{h_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^2}$ are as in (1.5). We can formally write $\widetilde{\mu}_s$ as

$$d\widetilde{\mu}_s = Z_s^{-1} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\int v^2 - \frac{1}{2}\int (D^s v)^2 - \frac{1}{2}\int u^2 - \frac{1}{2}\int |\nabla u|^2 - \frac{1}{2}\int (D^{s+1}u)^2} du dv,$$

where

$$D := \sqrt{-\Delta}.$$

As we shall see below, the expression

$$\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} v^2 + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (D^s v)^2 + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} u^2 + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} |\nabla u|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (D^{s+1}u)^2 \tag{6.1}$$

appears as the quadratic part of the renormalized energy in the context of the nonlinear wave equation. We have the following statement.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $s > \frac{1}{2}$. Then, the Gaussian measures μ_s and $\widetilde{\mu}_s$ are equivalent.*

Remark 6.2. In view of Lemma 6.1, it suffices to study the quasi-invariance property of $\widetilde{\mu}_s$ under the flow of the defocusing cubic nonlinear wave equation.

Proof. Note that μ_s and $\widetilde{\mu}_s$ are product measures on u and v. Define (formally) μ_s^1 and μ_s^2 by

$$d\mu_s^1 = Z^{-1} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\int (J^{s+1}u)^2} du \qquad \text{and} \qquad d\mu_s^2 = Z^{-1} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\int (J^s v)^2} dv.$$

Then, we have $\mu_s = \mu_s^1 \otimes \mu_s^2$. Similarly, by defining $\widetilde{\mu}_s^1$ and $\widetilde{\mu}_s^2$ by

$$d\widetilde{\mu}_s^1 = Z^{-1} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\int u^2 - \frac{1}{2}\int |\nabla u|^2 - \frac{1}{2}\int (D^{s+1}u)^2} du,$$
$$d\widetilde{\mu}_s^2 = Z^{-1} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\int v^2 - \frac{1}{2}\int (D^s v)^2} dv,$$

we have $\widetilde{\mu}_s = \widetilde{\mu}_s^1 \otimes \widetilde{\mu}_s^2$. Hence, it suffices to prove that μ_s^j and $\widetilde{\mu}_s^j$ are equivalent, $j = 1, 2$.

First, let us consider the $j = 1$ case. Given $\sigma < s$, define λ_n and $\widetilde{\lambda}_n$ by

$$\lambda_n = \frac{1}{\langle n\rangle^{2s+2-2\sigma}} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \widetilde{\lambda}_n = \frac{\langle n\rangle^{2\sigma}}{1+|n|^2+|n|^{2s+2}}.$$

Then, μ_s^1 and $\widetilde{\mu}_s^1$ are the Gaussian measures on $H^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^2)$ with the covariance operators Q and $\widetilde{Q}$ given by[4]

$$Qe_n = \lambda_n e_n \qquad \text{and} \qquad \widetilde{Q}e_n = \widetilde{\lambda}_n e_n,$$

respectively, where $e_n(x) = e^{in\cdot x}$. Now, define S_n by

$$S_n = \frac{(\lambda_n - \widetilde{\lambda}_n)^2}{(\lambda_n + \widetilde{\lambda}_n)^2}.$$

Then, by Kakutani's theorem [10] (or Feldman-Hájek theorem [7, 9]), it follows that μ_s^1 and $\widetilde{\mu}_s^1$ are equivalent if and only if

$$\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^2} S_n < \infty. \tag{6.2}$$

Otherwise, they are singular.

We have

$$S_n = \frac{(1+|n|^2+|n|^{2s+2}-\langle n\rangle^{2s+2})^2}{(1+|n|^2+|n|^{2s+2}+\langle n\rangle^{2s+2})^2} \sim \frac{(1+|n|^2+|n|^{2s+2}-(1+|n|^2)^{s+1})^2}{\langle n\rangle^{4s+4}}.$$

By the mean value theorem applied to $f(x) = x^{s+1}$, we have

$$\big||n|^{2s+2} - (1+|n|^2)^{s+1}\big| = |f(|n|^2) - f(1+|n|^2)| \sim |n|^{2s}.$$

Hence, we obtain

$$S_n \sim \frac{(1+|n|^2+|n|^{2s})^2}{\langle n\rangle^{4s+4}} \lesssim \frac{1+|n|^4+|n|^{4s}}{\langle n\rangle^{4s+4}},$$

which is summable over $\mathbb{Z}^2$, provided that $s > \frac{1}{2}$. This proves (6.2) and the equivalence of μ_s^1 and $\widetilde{\mu}_s^1$. A similar computation yields the equivalence of μ_s^2 and $\widetilde{\mu}_s^2$. We omit details. □

6.2. **Renormalized energy for NLW.** In this subsection, we derive the renormalized energy in the context of the truncated NLW:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u = v \\ \partial_t v = \Delta u - \pi_N((\pi_N u)^3). \end{cases} \tag{6.3}$$

Once the renormalized energy is derived, the remaining of the proof of Theorem 1.1 is exactly the same as the proof of Theorem 1.2.

If (u, v) is a solution to the truncated NLW (6.3), then we have

$$\partial_t\bigg[\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{T}^2}(D^s v_N)^2 + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{T}^2}(D^{s+1}u_N)^2\bigg] = \int_{\mathbb{T}^2}(D^{2s}v_N)(-u_N^3), \tag{6.4}$$

[4]Namely, Q and $\widetilde{Q}$ are defined by the following relations:

$$-\frac{1}{2}\int (J^{s+1}u)^2 = -\frac{1}{2}\langle Q^{-1}u, u\rangle_{H^\sigma} \quad \text{and} \quad -\frac{1}{2}\int \big(u^2 + |\nabla u|^2 + (D^{s+1}u)^2\big) = -\frac{1}{2}\langle \widetilde{Q}^{-1}u, u\rangle_{H^\sigma}.$$

where $(u_N, v_N) = (\pi_N u, \pi_N v)$ as before. Let $s \geq 2$ be an even integer. Then, by the Leibniz rule, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (D^{2s} v_N)(-u_N^3) &= -3 \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} D^s v_N \, D^s u_N \, u_N^2 \\ &\quad + \sum_{\substack{|\alpha|+|\beta|+|\gamma|=s \\ |\alpha|,|\beta|,|\gamma|<s}} c_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma} \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} D^s v_N \cdot \partial^\alpha u_N \cdot \partial^\beta u_N \cdot \partial^\gamma u_N \end{aligned} \tag{6.5}$$

for some inessential constants $c_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}$. Furthermore, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}-3 \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} D^s v_N \, D^s u_N \, u_N^2 &= -\frac{3}{2} \partial_t \bigg[\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (D^s u_N)^2 u_N^2 \bigg] + 3 \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (D^s u_N)^2 v_N u_N \\ &= -\frac{3}{2} \partial_t \bigg[\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \mathbf{P}_{\neq 0}[(D^s u_N)^2] \, \mathbf{P}_{\neq 0}[u_N^2] \bigg] + 3 \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \mathbf{P}_{\neq 0}[(D^s u_N)^2] \, \mathbf{P}_{\neq 0}[v_N u_N] \\ &\quad - \frac{3}{2} \partial_t \bigg[\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (D^s u_N)^2 \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} u_N^2 \bigg] + 3 \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (D^s u_N)^2 \int v_N u_N. \end{aligned} \tag{6.6}$$

As in (1.15), the last two terms on the right-hand side are problematic. Therefore, we once again introduce a suitable renormalization. Define $\widetilde{\sigma}_N$ by

$$\widetilde{\sigma}_N = \mathbb{E}_{\widetilde{\mu}_s} \bigg[\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (D^s \pi_N u)^2 \bigg] = \sum_{\substack{n \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \\ |n| \leq N}} \frac{|n|^{2s}}{1 + |n|^2 + |n|^{2s+2}} \sim \log N.$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&-\frac{3}{2} \partial_t \bigg[\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (D^s u_N)^2 \int u_N^2 \bigg] + 3 \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (D^s u_N)^2 \int v_N u_N \\ &\quad = -\frac{3}{2} \partial_t \bigg[\bigg(\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (D^s u_N)^2 - \widetilde{\sigma}_N \bigg) \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} u_N^2 \bigg] + 3 \bigg(\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (D^s u_N)^2 - \widetilde{\sigma}_N \bigg) \int v_N u_N. \end{aligned} \tag{6.7}$$

Thanks to the Wiener chaos estimate (Lemma 3.2), the term

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (D^s u_N)^2 - \widetilde{\sigma}_N$$

enjoys the bound

$$\bigg\| \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (D^s \pi_N u)^2 - \widetilde{\sigma}_N \bigg\|_{L^p(d\widetilde{\mu}_s(u,v))} \leq Cp,$$

for any finite $p \geq 2$, where the constant $C > 0$ is independent of p and N.

We now define the renormalized energy $H_{s,N}(u, v)$ by

$$H_{s,N}(u, v) = \frac{1}{2} \int (D^s v)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \int (D^{s+1} u)^2 + \frac{3}{2} \int (D^s u)^2 u^2 - \frac{3}{2} \widetilde{\sigma}_N \int u^2$$

Then, it follows from (6.4) - (6.7) that, if (u, v) is a solution to (6.3), then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t H_{s,N}(u_N, v_N) &= 3 \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \mathbf{P}_{\neq 0}[(D^s u_N)^2] \, \mathbf{P}_{\neq 0}[v_N u_N] + 3 \bigg(\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (D^s u_N)^2 - \widetilde{\sigma}_N \bigg) \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} v_N u_N \\ &\quad + \sum_{\substack{|\alpha|+|\beta|+|\gamma|=s \\ |\alpha|,|\beta|,|\gamma|<s}} c_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma} \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} D^s v_N \cdot \partial^\alpha u_N \cdot \partial^\beta u_N \cdot \partial^\gamma u_N. \end{aligned} \tag{6.8}$$

As in Subsection 1.4, all terms in the right-hand-side of (6.8) are suitable for a perturbative analysis. However, a modification of the quadratic part is needed in order to have a resulting measure absolutely continuous with respect to μ_s.

For this purpose, we define the full normalized energy $E_{s,N}(u,v)$ as

$$E_{s,N}(u,v) = H_{s,N}(u,v) + E_N(u,v),$$

where E_N is the energy for the truncated NLKG defined in (1.12). The quadratic part of $E_{s,N}$ is now given by (6.1), resulting in the Gaussian measure $\widetilde{\mu}_s$ equivalent to μ_s. Using the truncated NLW (6.3), we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t E_{s,N}(u_N, v_N) &= \partial_t H_{s,N}(u_N, v_N) + \partial_t E_N(u_N, v_N)\\ &= \partial_t H_{s,N}(u_N, v_N) + \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} u_N v_N.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the only new term to be handled as compared to the proof of Theorem 1.2 is

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} u_N v_N\,. \tag{6.9}$$

More precisely, we need to estimate (6.9) under the restriction on the truncated energy H_N:

$$H_N(u,v) := \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \big(|\nabla u|^2 + v^2\big)dx + \frac{1}{4}\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (\pi_N u)^4 dx \le r. \tag{6.10}$$

By the compactness of the domain $\mathbb{T}^2$, we have

$$\left|\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} u_N v_N\right| \le \|\pi_N u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)}\|\pi_N v\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} \le \|\pi_N u\|_{L^4(\mathbb{T}^2)}\|\pi_N v\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)} \le C_r$$

under (6.10). Therefore, the contribution of (6.9) to $\partial_t E_{s,N}(u_N, v_N)$ is easy to deal with. We finally note that the introduction of $E_N(u,v)$ in the definition of the modified energy leads to the introduction of a new harmless term $\int(\pi_N u)^4$ in the definition of the weighted Gaussian measures $\rho_{s,N,r}$. The remaining part of the analysis leading to the proof of Theorem 1.1 is exactly the same as the one already presented in the proof of Theorem 1.2 and therefore we omit details.

Appendix A. On the dispersion generalized NLKG

In this appendix, we briefly discuss the situation for the (much easier) dispersion generalized NLKG (1.22) with $\beta > 1$. The equation (1.22) is a Hamiltonian equation with the Hamiltonian given by

$$E^\beta(u) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (J^\beta u)^2 + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} v^2 + \frac{1}{4}\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} u^4.$$

By repeating the computation in Subsection 1.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t\left[\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{T}^2}(J^s v)^2 + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{T}^2}(J^{s+\beta}u)^2\right] &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} J^{2s} v(-u^3)\\ &= -3\int_{\mathbb{T}^2}(\partial_t J^s u) J^s u\cdot u^2 + \text{l.o.t.}\\ &= -\frac{3}{2}\partial_t\left[\int_{\mathbb{T}^2}(J^s u)^2 u^2\right] + 3\int_{\mathbb{T}^2}(J^s u)^2 \partial_t u\cdot u + \text{l.o.t.},\end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

where "l.o.t." denotes various (insignificant) lower order terms. Define $E^\beta_s(u,v)$ and $E^\beta_{s,N}(u,v)$by

$$E^\beta_s(u,v) = \frac{1}{2}\int (J^s\partial_t u)^2 + \frac{1}{2}\int (J^{s+\beta}u)^2 + \frac{3}{2}\int (J^s u)^2 u^2, \tag{A.2}$$

$$E^\beta_{s,N}(u,v) = \frac{1}{2}\int (J^s\partial_t u)^2 + \frac{1}{2}\int (J^{s+\beta}u)^2 + \frac{3}{2}\int (J^s \pi_N u)^2 (\pi_N u)^2. \tag{A.3}$$

Define the following weighted Gaussian measure $\rho^\beta_{s,N,r}$, $N\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{\infty\}$, by

$$d\rho^\beta_{s,N,r} = Z^{-1}\mathbf{1}_{\{E^\beta_N(u,v)\le r\}} e^{-E^\beta_{s,N}(u,v)} du dv = Z^{-1}\mathbf{1}_{\{E^\beta_N(u,v)\le r\}} e^{-\frac{3}{2}\int (J^s\pi_N u)^2(\pi_N u)^2} d\mu^\beta_s,$$

where E^β_N is the truncated energy defined by

$$E^\beta_N(u) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (J^\beta u)^2 + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} v^2 + \frac{1}{4}\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (\pi_N u)^4.$$

Then, in view of the comment in Remark 1.5, we can repeat the argument in Section 3 (without any renormalization) and show that $\rho^\beta_{s,N,r}$ is a well defined probability measure (even when $r=\infty$ thanks to the defocusing nature of the equation) with a uniform bound in $N\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{\infty\}$.

Let us now turn to the energy estimate. Let $s\ge\beta>1$. It follows from (A.1), (A.2), and (A.3) that

$$\partial_t E^\beta_{s,N}(u,v) = 3\int (J^s\pi_N u)^2\cdot \pi_N u\cdot \pi_N u + \text{l.o.t.} \tag{A.4}$$

for a solution (u,v) to the following truncated dispersion generalized NLKG:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u = v \\ \partial_t v = J^{2\beta}u - \pi_N((\pi_N u)^3). \end{cases}$$

By interpolation and the Sobolev embedding $H^\beta(\mathbb{T}^2)\subset L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^2)$, $\beta>1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\bigg|\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (J^s\pi_N u)^2\cdot\pi_N v\cdot\pi_N u\bigg| &\le \|J^s\pi_N u\|^2_{L^4_x}\underbrace{\|\pi_N v\|_{L^2_x}\|\pi_N u\|_{L^\infty_x}}_{\lesssim E^\beta_N(u,v)} \\ &\lesssim \|J^{s+\beta-1-\varepsilon}\pi_N u\|^{2(1-\theta)}_{L^r_x}\big(E^\beta_N(u,v)\big)^{1+2\theta},\end{aligned}$$

for some $\theta\in(0,1]$ and $r>4$ satisfying

$$s = \theta\beta + (1-\theta)(s+\beta-1-\varepsilon) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \frac{1}{4} = \frac{\theta}{2} + \frac{1-\theta}{r}.$$

Hence, by the Wiener chaos estimate (Lemma 3.2), we obtain the crucial energy estimate:

$$\bigg\|\mathbf{1}_{\{E^\beta_N(u,v)\le r\}}\cdot\int_{\mathbb{T}^2}(J^s\pi_N u)^2\cdot\pi_N v\cdot\pi_N u\bigg\|_{L^p(d\mu^\beta_s)} \lesssim p^{1-\theta}$$

for some $\theta>0$. The lower order terms in (A.4) can be handled in a similar (or easier) manner. Then, one can repeat the argument in [23] and prove quasi-invariance of the Gaussian measure μ^β_s, at least for an even integer $s\ge\beta$.

Acknowledgements. T.O. was supported by the European Research Council (grant no. 637995 "ProbDynDispEq"). The authors would like to thank Andrew Stuart for pointing out the last remark in Subsection 1.3.

References

[1] J. Bourgain, *Invariant measures for the 2D-defocusing nonlinear Schrödinger equation*, Comm. Math. Phys. 176 (1996), no. 2, 421–445.
[2] J. Bourgain, *Gibbs measures and quasi-periodic solutions for nonlinear Hamiltonian partial differential equations,* The Gelfand Mathematical Seminars, 1993–1995, 23–43, Gelfand Math. Sem., Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1996.
[3] R. Cameron, W. Martin, *Transformations of Wiener integrals under translations*, Ann. of Math. 45, (1944). 386–396.
[4] A.B. Cruzeiro, *Équations différentielles ordinaires: non explosion et mesures quasi-invariantes,* (French) J. Funct. Anal. 54 (1983), no. 2, 193–205.
[5] A.B. Cruzeiro, *Équations différentielles sur l'espace de Wiener et formules de Cameron-Martin non-linéaires*, (French) J. Funct. Anal. 54 (1983), no. 2, 206–227.
[6] G. Da Prato, L. Tubaro, *Wick powers in stochastic PDEs: an introduction,* Technical Report UTM, 2006, 39 pp.
[7] J. Feldman *Equivalence and perpendicularity of Gaussian processes,* Pacific J. Math. 8 (1958) 699–708.
[8] L. Gross, *Abstract Wiener spaces,* Proc. 5th Berkeley Sym. Math. Stat. Prob. 2 (1965), 31–42.
[9] J. Hájek *On a property of normal distribution of any stochastic process*, (Russian. English summary) Czechoslovak Math. J. 8 (83) (1958) 610–618.
[10] S. Kakutani, *On equivalence of infinite product measures,* Ann. of Math. 49, (1948). 214–224.
[11] H. Kuo, *Gaussian measures in Banach spaces,* Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 463. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1975. vi+224 pp.
[12] E. Nelson, *A quartic interaction in two dimensions*, 1966 Mathematical Theory of Elementary Particles (Proc. Conf., Dedham, Mass., 1965) pp. 69–73 M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, Mass.
[13] T. Oh, P. Sosoe, N. Tzvetkov, *An optimal regularity result on the quasi-invariant Gaussian measures for the cubic fourth order nonlinear Schrödinger equation,* preprint.
[14] T. Oh, L. Thomann, *Invariant Gibbs measures for the 2-d defocusing nonlinear Schrödinger equations*, arXiv:1509.02093 [math.AP].
[15] T. Oh, L. Thomann, *Invariant Gibbs measures for the 2-d defocusing nonlinear wave equations,* preprint.
[16] T. Oh, N. Tzvetkov, *Quasi-invariant Gaussian measures for the cubic fourth order nonlinear Schrödinger equation,* Probab. Theory Relat. Fields (2016). doi:10.1007/s00440-016-0748-7
[17] T. Oh, N. Tzvetkov, *On the transport of Gaussian measures under the flow of Hamiltonian PDEs,* Sémin. Équ. Dériv. Partielles. 2015-2016, Exp. No. 6, 9 pp.
[18] R. Ramer, *On nonlinear transformations of Gaussian measures*, J. Functional Analysis 15 (1974), 166–187.
[19] B. Simon, *The $P(\varphi)_2$ Euclidean (quantum) field theory,* Princeton Series in Physics. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1974. xx+392 pp.
[20] L. Thomann, N. Tzvetkov, *Gibbs measure for the periodic derivative nonlinear Schrödinger equation*, Nonlinearity 23 (2010), no. 11, 2771–2791.
[21] N. Tzvetkov, *Construction of a Gibbs measure associated to the periodic Benjamin-Ono equation,* Probab. Theory Related Fields 146 (2010), no. 3-4, 481–514.
[22] N. Tzvetkov, *Invariant measures for the defocusing Nonlinear Schrödinger equation (Mesures invariantes pour l'équation de Schrödinger non linéaire),* Annales de l'Institut Fourier, 58 (2008), 2543–2604.
[23] N. Tzvetkov, *Quasi-invariant Gaussian measures for one dimensional Hamiltonian PDE's,* Forum Math. Sigma 3 (2015), e28, 35 pp.
[24] N. Tzvetkov, N. Visciglia, *Gaussian measures associated to the higher order conservation laws of the Benjamin-Ono equation,* Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. 46 (2013), no. 2, 249–299.
[25] N. Tzvetkov, N. Visciglia, *Invariant measures and long-time behavior for the Benjamin-Ono equation,* Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN (2014), no. 17, 4679–4714.
[26] V. Yudovich, Non-stationary flows of an ideal incompressible fluid, Zh. Vychisl. Math. i Math. Fiz. (1963) 1032–1066 (1963) (in Russian).

Tadahiro Oh, School of Mathematics, The University of Edinburgh, and The Maxwell Institute for the Mathematical Sciences, James Clerk Maxwell Building, The King's Buildings, Peter Guthrie Tait Road, Edinburgh, EH9 3FD, United Kingdom

E-mail address: hiro.oh@ed.ac.uk

Nikolay Tzvetkov, Université de Cergy-Pontoise, 2, av. Adolphe Chauvin, 95302 Cergy-Pontoise Cedex,, France

E-mail address: nikolay.tzvetkov@u-cergy.fr